

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR RESERVOIR AREAS UNDER
JURISDICTION OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

(No. 86-21)



HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

ON H.R. 9377
TO PROVIDE FOR THE PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR
RESERVOIR AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE SEC-
RETARY OF THE ARMY AND THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

FEBRUARY 23, 1960

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1960

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland
CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama
FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois
T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana
IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, Georgia
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
W. R. HULL, Jr., Missouri
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma
JOHN J. McFALL, California
CHARLES H. (CHARLIE) BROWN, Missouri
GRACIE PFOST, Idaho
JOHN YOUNG, Texas
DENVER D. HARGIS, Kansas
FRANK W. BURKE, Kentucky
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
ROBERT E. COOK, Ohio

JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington
GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio
GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr., California
FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
EDWIN B. DOOLEY, New York
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York
DEAN P. TAYLOR, New York
WALTER M. MUMMA, Pennsylvania

MARGARET R. BEITER, *Chief Clerk*

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, *Chief Counsel*

JOSEPH R. BRENNAN, *Engineer-Consultant*

ROBERT F. McCONNELL, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT

FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi, *Chairman*

CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana
IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, Georgia
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
W. R. HULL, Jr., Missouri
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma
JOHN J. McFALL, California
CHARLES H. (CHARLIE) BROWN, Missouri
GRACIE PFOST, Idaho

WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington
GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin
JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr., California
FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York

CONTENTS

H.R. 9377-----	Page 1
Statement of—	
Cassidy, Maj. Gen. William F., Assistant Chief of Engineers on Civil Works, Corps of Engineers-----	18
Hodges, Ralph, director, Division of Forestry; accompanied by A. Z. Nelson, director of the Industry-Government Affairs Division, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.-----	9
May, W. W., appearing on behalf of the Mississippi Forestry Association, Jackson, Miss-----	2
Murphy, Warren T., Chief, Division of Flood Prevention and River Basin Programs, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture-----	22
Mitchell, Donald S., Jr., Assistant Chief, Division of Irrigation and Land Use, Bureau of Reclamation; accompanied by Walter H. Horning, forestry staff officer, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior-----	23
Phillips, George, Department of Agriculture-----	22
Pomeroy, Kenneth B., chief forester, The American Forestry Association, Washington, D.C.-----	6
Additional information—	
Smith, Hon. Frank E., letters submitted by:	
Corps of Engineers, February 19, 1960-----	17
Forestry Suppliers, Inc., February 19, 1960-----	17
Louisiana Forestry Association, February 22, 1960-----	16

PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR RESERVOIR AREAS UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1960

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:05 a.m., in room 1302, New House Office Building, Hon. Frank E. Smith (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. SMITH. The hearing of the Subcommittee on Watershed Development on the bill H.R. 9377 will come to order. The bill will be made a part of the record at this point in the hearing.

(H.R. 9377 is as follows:)

[H.R. 9377, 86th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to provide that reservoir areas of projects for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and other related purposes under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate and dependable future resources of readily available timber, through sustained yield programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation practices, and to increase the value of such areas for conservation, recreation, and other beneficial uses.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the national policy declared in the first section of this Act, the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, shall provide for the protection and development of forest cover of reservoir areas under his jurisdiction, so as to yield the maximum benefit and otherwise improve such areas. Programs and policies developed pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be coordinated with the Secretary of Agriculture, and with appropriate State conservation agencies.

Mr. SMITH. I might say that I introduced this bill with the idea that it would provide a directive for a much needed improvement in the management of those forest reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

The first witness that we have this morning is Mr. W. W. May. Mr. May represents the Mississippi Forestry Association from Jackson, Miss.

Mr. May, will you come forward to the witness chair, please, and have a seat?

STATEMENT OF W. W. MAY, APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE
MISSISSIPPI FORESTRY ASSOCIATION, JACKSON, MISS.

Mr. MAY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Give the reporter your name and then you may go ahead with your statement.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am W. W. May, of Jackson, Miss. I am appearing here today as a representative of the Mississippi Forestry Association, of which I am a director, and of the Delta Council, of which I am a member of the forestry committee.

Both of these organizations are nonprofit groups dedicated to the development of the economics of the Mississippi. The Mississippi Forestry Association through its membership, consisting of the entire forestry leadership of the State, concerns itself with every phase of forestry in Mississippi. The Delta Council concerns itself with the total economic development of the 18 delta and part-delta counties, and is thus immediately concerned with the effectiveness and long life of the flood control system operated by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army. The Council is also interested in the forestry development of this section of Mississippi from an economic standpoint.

I am also forester for the Illinois Central Railroad. My company is deeply concerned with the economic phases of this question, as are many of the forest industries in this general area.

Forestry, gentlemen, is a serious business with us in Mississippi. One-quarter or our cash income is derived from forestry activities. It offers the greatest hope of sound economic development for much of our State. This is particularly true of the area in which Arkabutler, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoirs are located.

The problem which the bill would help to solve in Mississippi concerns itself with approximately 236,000 acres of a total area of 263,000 acres held by the Corps of Engineers in the reservoir watershed. These reservoirs are located on the Yazoo, Little Tallahatchie flood control system. Around this single ownership represented by these reservoir lands are located approximately 25,000 private ownerships within the watershed of this system who must be shown the way to good forest management.

Specifically, the problem concerns itself with proper land utilization of those parts of the reservoir area not subject to annual overflow. Much of this land is in a seriously eroded condition. Runoff from heavy rains on the steep slopes continues to create gullies and carry silt into the main body of the reservoir, which I am sure is increasing the sedimentation problem.

The Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service working with the U.S. Forest Service have undertaken reforestation and erosion control work in certain parts of the Corps of Engineers land. However, the acreage that has been reforested is small and no new work of this kind has been initiated in several years.

We recognize in Mississippi that the primary function of the Army Engineers in their reservoir areas is to provide efficient flood protection for the millions of acres of fertile land below the reservoirs.

Nothing is proposed that would in any way jeopardize this important mission. The fact is, however, that the land in these reservoir areas is primarily suited for the growth of timber. With re-

forestation and proper management this land could yield a sustained dividend to the Government of the United States. In addition to the timber harvested from these areas it could provide valuable raw materials for industries. It is conservatively estimated that a substantial income could be obtained in a relatively short time from these lands if they were properly managed.

From these facts it is indicated that we need the Corps of Engineers land in the best possible condition, as an example to private owners in this watershed, with the added value of direct return to the Government and communities from the sale of forest products from this area.

Gentlemen, we believe that the situation is comparable on many of the other watersheds that are classified as forest lands and under the control of the Corps of Engineers. We cite here simply the situation in Mississippi and recommend to you the favorable consideration of this bill.

I would also like to point out again that this program has particular merit to this committee because of the fact we believe it will eventually pay its own way.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

MR. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. May. That is a very good summary of the purpose of the bill.

You emphasized in your statement about the situation in Mississippi. The need for improvement, though, is not confined to Mississippi by any means.

MR. MAY. No, Mr. Chairman. In my opinion the other reservoir areas—I am thoroughly familiar with the situation in Mississippi; however, my information is only hearsay and observation with respect to one or two reservoirs in other States.

MR. SMITH. I wanted to ask you to testify in respect to the bill primarily because I wanted somebody who had a special interest in it to speak with regard to the local conditions within one individual State.

Are there any questions, Mr. Clark?

MR. CLARK. No questions.

MR. SMITH. Mr. Mack?

MR. MACK. Mr. May, I notice from the list of acreages that would come under this bill, 81,800 acres in Mississippi would be made suitable for the planting and growing of trees. Is that correct?

MR. MAY. Approximately that amount. Yes.

MR. MACK. How long does it take to produce a sawlog in Mississippi?

MR. MAY. We estimate now it will be approximately 20 years for an economic return on this particular site in the reservoir area. I understand it will vary from acre to acre.

MR. MACK. You mean that after 20 years of growth a tree is suitable for the making of lumber?

MR. MAY. Yes, sir. In our area it is. I would recommend a little longer. Twenty-seven, we figure to be the longest we can afford. Twenty-seven years we figure to be the longest we can afford, with taxes, and other expenses, to grow it.

MR. MACK. You grow timber a great deal faster than we do in the West. We figure 60 years for sawlogs.

Mr. MAY. Yes, sir. We believe we have a little bit of a margin on you through our ability to grow timber more rapidly in the South.

Mr. MACK. Your timber there is now mostly third growth; is it not?

Mr. MAY. Second growth.

Mr. MACK. Third?

Mr. MAY. In some cases it is more than that.

Mr. SMITH. We do not grow them quite as tall, though.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. What type of lumber is this?

Mr. MAY. The large utilization as referred to in the reservoir area will probably be pulpwood, and only a small percentage of sawlogs in the area. It appears that our economic development is going that way as far as timber is concerned.

Mr. SMITH. In relation to that type of area which might be made available from the proper management of these reservoir areas, since there is growth already in these areas, it would not necessarily take 20 years before selective types of cuttings could be made in the area. Is that right, Mr. May?

Mr. MAY. The assumption that it would take 20 years is when you start from the planting on bare land. In other words, if you have a start of 5 or 6 or 7 years, you can deduct that much from your time until the economic return is realized.

Mr. SMITH. Do you have any further questions?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I have, Mr. Chairman.

First I want to say I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman with respect to this hearing. It is a very important problem and it is a problem in many areas of the United States which needs the special attention of this committee.

I am wondering if there are any studies available in your State which would indicate the number of acres that would be available and recommended for this type of thing. Does it involve hydroelectric power development, as you indicated, which are under the jurisdiction of the Army?

Mr. MAY. Is that in the case of Corps of Engineers land, sir?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

Mr. MAY. We have completed a rather comprehensive survey of the forest situation on the Corps of Engineers land as applied to these four reservoirs, which is probably accurate within a few percent of just the type of development needed. It was conducted at the request of your chairman by the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and other agencies joining with them. We have a complete study of the situation on those reservoirs.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It surely must be more than 81,000 acres.

Mr. SMITH. If I may interrupt, Mr. Schwengel. This bill will apply only to reservoir lands presently owned by the Corps of Engineers for their management. A total of 81,000 acres in Mississippi. There is a reference to hydroelectric power in the bill. That means any of the lands owned by the Corps of Engineers for any of these purposes for which it owns any part of this country. It happens they do not own any hydroelectric projects in this part. This will not start anything, but just on presently owned lands that they will institute the timber management practices on.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I understand that limitation of the bill, but my question is on the overall program are there any studies to show how

much land in Mississippi would be better used for forestry development than for anything else?

Mr. MAY. There is approximately, as we know it, in good, sound economic practices now, out of this total area, I believe about 56,000 acres that they came up with that needs treatment. I think when we know a little bit more about the water-edge lands, there is perhaps a potential there, but they do not go beyond 56,000 acres now needing immediate attention.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In the entire four States?

Mr. MAY. In the whole reservoir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. My question is, in the whole State. It seems to me that this is a national problem and if we are in this watershed program I think we ought to step it up. My question is, are there any other areas in the State of Mississippi that are more adaptable to this type of conservation than others?

Mr. MAY. No, sir. This is one of our serious drawbacks in this area. We can reach most of the other lands simply by education of the private owners, which in an indirect way we hope to do with this bill. Through cooperation with the industrial ownership, the other watersheds are largely in private ownership at this time and are making good progress in their problem.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You do not have any idea of the cost per acre of the development of lumber in the area if you had to start from scratch?

Mr. MAY. Roughly, \$15 to \$20 an acre, I believe, is estimated on the Corps of Engineers land. I have an exact breakdown on that in my file.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is for the whole area?

Mr. MAY. For the whole area.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. How much per acre?

Mr. MAY. \$15 to \$20.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Per year?

Mr. MAY. No. That is the initial cost to do the job and then there are certain carrying costs such as fire protection, which amounts to about 15 cents an acre for fire protection, and 50 cents an acre for management, and that sort of thing.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Per year?

Mr. MAY. Yes. And the \$15 to \$20 is an initial fixed investment.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. \$15 to \$20 a year would mean at most then it would cost \$35 to \$40.

Mr. MAY. About that.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. And what would be the value of the lumber at the end of that time when you start using it? Approximately?

Mr. MAY. We estimate this land will produce about 300 board feet per acre per year for the entire area. Of course, it is an average figure. And for the corps area when it comes in production with the 50,000 acres, around a half a million dollars a year.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. For the entire area?

Mr. MAY. Of course, that is a very general estimate, but it fits in with our industrial estimates on private lands that are being managed, with the cost figures given.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That will probably be well over a thousand dollars an acre, with a \$40 an acre investment. Am I calculating correctly? Is that about right? About a thousand dollars an acre?

Mr. MAY. I am afraid I have misstated it some place if you arrive at that high a value.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You said a half a million dollars on 56,000 acres, or did you mean 81,000 acres?

Mr. MAY. I was thinking in terms of 56,000 acres that would have an earning power of about \$10 per acre per year, and Mr. Pomeroy can give you some information on the quality of material we produce.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McFall.

Mr. McFALL. No questions.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Cramer.

Mr. CRAMER. What present program do you have of this nature in the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. MAY. What program do they have at this time?

Mr. CRAMER. That is all right. You do not need to answer that question. I understand we will have other witnesses here testifying on that.

Mr. SMITH. I think the fact that they do not have a primary interest in this is because they do not have any program.

Thank you very much, Mr. May.

The next witness we have is Mr. Kenneth Pomeroy, chief forester of the American Forestry Association.

We are glad to have you here, Mr. Pomeroy.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH B. POMEROY, CHIEF FORESTER, THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am Kenneth Pomeroy, the chief forester of the American Forestry Association. This is a citizens' association, a nonprofit education organization. It is also the oldest forestry association in America, having been organized in 1875. From time to time this association has held national forest congresses to consider the problems of the day. The first such congress was held in 1882 in Cincinnati, and as a direct outgrowth from that congress we had the formation of many State forestry associations and State forestry departments, and eventually the creation of a Federal reserve.

A more recent congress was held in Washington in 1953, and from that congress there were several resolutions that developed that pertained directly to the bill you people have before you.

I am going to give the clerk a copy of our program for American forestry, so that he may refer to it if he wishes. I would like to call his attention to the three important goals for forestry in America:

(1) To meet the essentials of forest protection;

(2) To improve the national timber crop in volume and quality to a degree sufficient to wipe out all deficits and build up a reserve;

(3) And this is where this bill begins to come in—to obtain the maximum of economic and social services from our forests by realistic application of the principle of multiple use in their management.

This should include all forest services, and management, which must give great weight to national requirements and the conservation of water and control of erosion.

Turning over to page 5, where this part is developed in more detail, it says:

In furnishing the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run, forest areas provide many services and products in addition to timber. Conflicts arise and the highest use must be considered paramount in any given area. Under the principle of multiple use, the wise administrator will establish the required priorities and plans to enable the area under his control to contribute the maximum in products and services.

The conservation of water has become a problem of nationwide importance and concern. Great sums are being expended yearly to protect watershed areas or to prevent soil erosion and sediment damage by uncontrolled runoff of water. The acuteness of the situation is emphasized by the increasing numbers of areas seriously threatened by shortages of water for domestic, industrial, agricultural, or recreational uses.

We recommend recognition of water conservation as of paramount importance in the management of many public forest and range lands. Public agencies should provide for:

1. Management of timber and grazing resources to improve the quantity, quality and regularity of water flow needed for domestic, agricultural, industrial and recreational use, and to prevent and eliminate water pollution.
2. Coordination of planning and application of watershed management and flood prevention measures on upstream forest, agricultural, and range lands with the construction of downstream flood control and water power development projects.
3. In Federal dam and water reservoir projects, consideration of their impact on public and other lands, and provision for replacement to the extent practical of impaired facilities and services.

Our association appreciates the fact that the Corps of Engineers have a primary objective in flood control, and we hope, of course, they will meet that primary objective, but when that has been done we hope that they will also as their secondary objective use and manage their forest lands so that they may be of benefit to all others.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Pomeroy.

Are there any questions on my right?

(No response.)

Mr. SMITH. On my left?

Mr. MACK. Mr. Pomeroy, is your association the association of which George Drake, of the State of Washington, was president?

Mr. POMEROY. No. Mr. Drake was president of the Professional Society of American Foresters, but he is also a director of our association.

Mr. MACK. He is a very able man.

Mr. POMEROY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MACK. And a very able forester.

Mr. POMEROY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MACK. The total amount of land that would be involved, as shown in the table supplied to us, is about 750,000 acres. Mr. May testified that the placing of this land under this program would add about \$10 an acre in growing timber values to the land. Is that about an average for the country?

Mr. POMEROY. I have not considered the economics of this proposal, but it sounds about right.

Mr. MACK. In other words, if it were to add \$10 an acre to the value, then the total benefits of the program would be about \$7 million a year?

Mr. POMEROY. Something like that. I am not qualified to state.

Mr. MACK. Would this program be administered under this bill by the U.S. Army Engineers rather than the Forest Service?

Mr. POMEROY. That is my understanding.

Mr. MACK. Do you know if there is any provision in law where the Army Engineers, if they managed this land, would return any percentage of revenues derived over to the counties in which the land is situated?

Mr. POMEROY. I could not say, but it sounds like a good idea.

Mr. MACK. I know that in forest land where timber is taken off the land, the counties receive 25 percent of the total sales price for use in those counties for school- and road-building purposes.

Mr. POMEROY. Our association feels that is desirable, that is, that the counties should receive a portion of the income.

Mr. MACK. You say you have no objection from your viewpoint to that amendment in any such legislation?

Mr. POMEROY. No, I do not.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to direct the question to you that I directed to the previous witness. I am getting your viewpoint on the problem from a national point of view because of the position which you hold.

Has your association or anybody made any studies to indicate how much land in America is more adaptable to this type of conservation than to any other?

Mr. POMEROY. We are now conducting a series of forest land watershed studies. We have completed one such study in the State of California and published a report. A second study has just reached the final stages in Minnesota, and I am about to begin a third study in North Carolina. We have not made such a study in the deep South.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Do you think there would be any virtue in having a national study directed from Washington possibly with the encouragement and help of the Government in this regard?

Mr. POMEROY. When the Forest Congress met in Washington here in 1953, one of the things listed in the program was the recommendation:

(1) Early action be taken by the Congress to establish a joint congressional committee, consisting of members of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the House Committee on Agriculture, whose objectives would be:

"(a) To consider a desirable pattern for ownership of Federal, State, and private forest, range and other conservation lands;

"(b) To formulate policies to guide action of public agencies toward achieving this pattern;

"(c) To recommend to the Congress legislation needed to enable the Federal agencies to implement these policies.

We have not gone forward with this sectional program. The second section was the recommendation that each State should make a study, and we have been trying to help them to make those State studies first, so that we could see what sort of an overall objective there should be.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I note you do not have a member of this committee who must necessarily, especially in this area of watersheds, consider this proposition in that recommendation. Do you have any opposition to that?

Mr. POMEROY. I think it is a serious oversight.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Do you have a bill prepared?

Mr. POMEROY. No, we do not.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Could you prepare one?

Mr. POMEROY. Not yet. Not until we finished our third State study.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You do not think you ought to do this yet?

Mr. POMEROY. You see, the basis of this landownership study is that our association offered to make one in a region where there was a high Federal ownership which automatically came in the West. It was financed by a grant from a private foundation in the State of California. Then we offered to make a second study in an area where there was large county or State ownership. Minnesota was chosen, where 39 percent of the land was in State and county ownership, and the Federal Government owns another 17 percent. That was also financed by private contributions.

Now we are beginning a third study in North Carolina, where only 8 percent of the land area is in public ownership of any kind. Most of the land in North Carolina is held by some 226,000 small landowners.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Are the States generally cooperating in this program to conduct the study?

Mr. POMEROY. We have had a great deal of cooperation, very fine cooperation, in the States in which the studies have been made.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Do you know anything about how this study is progressing in Iowa?

Mr. POMEROY. No, I do not. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Is there any way to get some information on this?

Mr. POMEROY. I was not aware that such a study was being made in Iowa, but I will try to find out.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I was not aware until recently that there were needs for these developments in Iowa either, but they are. There happen to be many, many thousands of acres that are very desirable for the development in my district, and I am interested in having some forestry information on the State of Iowa. So I would be very anxious to see that report.

Mr. POMEROY. Thank you, sir. I will see you get copies of the ones that are available here, Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Pomeroy.

The next witness will be introduced by Mr. A. Z. Nelson, of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association. Mr. Nelson.

STATEMENT OF RALPH HODGES, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF FORESTRY; ACCOMPANIED BY A. Z. NELSON, DIRECTOR OF THE INDUSTRY-GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS DIVISION, NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, my name is A. Z. Nelson. I am director of the industry-Government affairs division of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association here in Washington. We very much appreciate the opportunity that you have afforded us to appear and testify on this bill. I regret to say that we do not have a pre-

pared statement to distribute to the committee. However, we have quite a bit to say, nevertheless.

Now I would like to introduce Mr. Ralph Hodges, who is the director of our division of forestry of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association. He will read a statement which he has prepared in behalf of the association, and then with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to supplement his remarks.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Nelson. You may proceed, Mr. Hodges. Go right ahead.

Mr. HODGES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Ralph D. Hodges, Jr. I am the director of the forestry division of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, a federation of 16 regional species and product associations representing the lumber manufacturing industry in all parts of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we are in agreement with the objective of the bill; to improve resource management on land around water projects under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. We have a minor amendment to suggest which Mr. Nelson will discuss later.

You know, of course that our industry is vitally concerned with the management of all the Nation's forest lands, whether publicly or privately owned.

Our industry has been concerned about the increasing trend of losses of well managed timberlands to such nontimber uses as reservoirs, rights-of-way for highways, powerlines, pipelines, defense establishments, and conservation projects.

Our first objective has been to keep the taking of timberlands to a minimum for the purpose. We believe that when projects are proposed that justification plans should take into account losses in timber production, losses in jobs, and losses to owners of manufacturing facilities made excess by their loss of raw material base.

In some cases more lands are acquired than needed for the project. We believe that when excess lands have been acquired they should be sold back to private ownership and continue in production and on the tax rolls. We see cases where excess lands are turned over to the U.S. Forest Service or other Government agencies instead of being sold. Where timberlands are to be flooded periodically, private forest management does not necessarily have to be eliminated.

The most serious problem of forest landowners losing lands to the Corps of Engineers is that the Federal Government does not pay adequate compensation. The Government will not pay for the losses caused where the owner cannot replace the raw material base needed to amortize mill facilities. We urge your support of the several bills now in Congress that would allow a study of this problem. These are H.R. 1066, by Representative Teller, and S. 2802, by Senator Sparkman. The two bills are similar.

In order to get consideration of the problem of adequate compensation the forest industries have suggested that the Government give the owner the option of taking other Federal land in exchange for his lands rather than the money offered. This proposal would keep Federal land acquisition to a minimum and would bring the problem of adequate compensation into sharper focus.

When this proposal was last made to the Congress, the Federal agencies involved objected on the grounds that the idea was not in the public interest and that it would violate tradition. The basic issue, however, is that in too many cases present regulations do not allow the corps to pay adequate compensation for lands taken. Exchange is only one solution that would not fit all cases. We sincerely hope this committee will look into this serious problem.

The Defense Department owns 29,821,304 acres of land, according to recent figures of the General Services Administration. Landownership for each service is reported as follows:

	<i>Acres</i>
Army-----	7, 927, 452
Corps of Engineers-----	4, 662, 997
Air Force-----	13, 903, 443
Navy-----	3, 327, 410

We do not know the figures on timber acreage, species, volume, value and growth for these lands. Since the Army owns about 1 million acres of commercial forest land out of its total of almost 8 million acres, we know the total land is considerable. We believe each service should have accurate and up-to-date resource inventories and forest management plans so the lands can be managed for full production of forest products insofar as it is economic and will not interfere with defense activities. We understand that some Defense Department lands have good inventories and plans and are under a high level of forest management. Apparently the degree of management depends upon the local military commander's interest in resource management and, to a certain extent, on the interest of the local Congressman or Senator. We believe Congress should have forest management a higher priority job in the Defense Department.

This bill would correct the situation for Corps of Engineers lands only and we do not know the percentage of the forest land in the Defense Department that would be affected.

Probably much of the land administered by the Corps of Engineers is permanently flooded or is overflow land or is in narrow strips around reservoirs. Some of these lands are suitable for intensive recreation such as campgrounds or boat launching sites. Some of these lands produce valuable timber crops. Timber management is compatible with recreation and under skilled forest managers even the heaviest used forest recreational areas can produce timber crops on a profitable basis. Much of the land around water projects is remote, steep and not usable for recreation. We urge that all these lands be managed for timber production, at least insofar as it is profitable to do so.

We have seen cases where timberland was acquired by the Corps of Engineers which previously had been the source of raw material for local industry. After acquisition timber management on these lands stopped. We believe there should be a forest management plan prepared by the Corps of Engineers before acquisition that will provide for the full yield of products from the lands in the future insofar as practical. These plans should be published so that communities, plant facilities and jobs dependent upon the forest can be adjusted and continue with a minimum of disturbance.

We request that this committee report favorably on this measure. However, we hope the committee report will include the following recommendations as an expression of viewpoint for future guidance of the Congress and the Defense Department:

1. Federal acquisition of private forest lands should be kept to a minimum.

2. Excess forest lands should be returned to private ownership and not transferred to other Government agencies for control or management.

3. There should be a study of the adequacy of compensation paid for forest lands acquired by the Federal Government.

4. All Defense Department lands should be inventoried for resource management so that a full yield of products can be secured under published management plans.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Hodges.

I will let Mr. Nelson complete his statement before we have any questions.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If it is agreeable to you and the committee, I can now present to you the minor amendment proposed to this bill. We have in mind that a slight change in language at the very end of the bill on page 2 be made, in the last sentence, lines 10, 11, and 12. A slight change in language in our opinion would improve the purpose and intent of that particular provision. I would like to read it as it is and then read it as we propose that it be changed:

Programs and policies developed pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be coordinated with the Secretary of Agriculture, and with appropriate State conservation agencies.

Our proposal would read as follows:

Programs and policies developed pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be coordinated with the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, with appropriate State conservation agencies, and to the extent possible, with local public and private ownership.

That is the proposal then that we have in mind. The purpose is probably obvious. There are occasions when the Department of the Interior would have an interest in areas surrounding or adjacent to reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers. Hence the suggestion that the Interior Department be included.

Secondly, adjacent landowners, counties, municipalities, and private tree farmers, might well have adjacent land, and we feel that in such circumstances there would be good reason for the Corps of Engineers attempting to coordinate their plans with such adjacent landowners whenever possible.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. I would like, if I may, to have a little more time, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to take too much time, but I do have one or two more points to make.

Mr. SMITH. If you have any points relative to this bill we would be glad to have them. We are interested in any points relative to general forest policy, but we are not able to do very much about it on this subcommittee.

Mr. NELSON. Yes. I do have something very specific related to this bill which Mr. Hodges has mentioned. It is not in the form of an

amendment, but it might well take the form of a statement in your committee report on the bill. You may recall Mr. Hodges referred to the need for inventories. We have very little information available with regard to the extent of lands, the acreage of lands, within these reservoir areas at the present time, and particularly as related to the extent of the timber land acreage. Therefore, we propose that it would be desirable for this committee to request of the Corps of Engineers information relating to the following specific points:

(a) The name and location of each flood control or multipurpose dam or reservoir that has been constructed, that is under construction, or that has been authorized.

(b) For each such dam and reservoir the total acreage of land embracing the project area which is under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, acquired, to be acquired or proposed for acquisition.

(c) For each such dam or reservoir the acreage of land inundated, or that will be inundated when the reservoir is full.

(d) For each dam and reservoir the total acreage of fringe lands, that is, the difference between the acreage in (b) and (c).

(e) For each dam and reservoir the acreage of land as part of (c) and (d) classified as forest land.

Finally, as (f), with regard to forest lands, for each dam listed in (e), the policies, plans or programs of the Corps of Engineers covering commercial timber management and timber harvesting operations, and the lease or disposal of forest lands to private operators for these purposes.

We submit, Mr. Chairman, that if this information were requested and supplied by the Corps of Engineers, it would provide a much better basis for understanding the problem we have before us today. We know it is a problem of considerable magnitude and I do believe that such information is available and could be supplied by the Corps of Engineers, and it would be very useful and helpful to the committee as well as everyone concerned.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Nelson.

I will tell you for your information that General Cassidy, the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, who is going to be our next witness before the committee, has already supplied the subcommittee with a list of all the reservoir lands that would be covered by this bill if it were put into effect. That has been shown to the members of the committee up here this morning and it will be made a part of the record of the hearing.

As to the information about authorized lands in authorized projects, that would be such a nebulous area that knowledge of such a situation would represent a considerable impracticality in presenting such a list. However, I am sure General Cassidy might be able to touch on that further if the members of the committee have any suggestions or questions about it.

Do the members have any questions from Mr. Hodges or Mr. Nelson?

Mr. CLARK. I have none.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McFall.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Hodges to amplify part of his remarks about some of the areas where the Corps of Engineers have taken over a forest area, and the forest conserva-

tion practices have stopped. Do you remember that part of your testimony, Mr. Hodges?

Mr. HODGES. Yes, sir.

Mr. McFALL. Will you amplify your testimony in that regard? Where were these cases, and to what extent?

Mr. HODGES. Yes, sir. Mr. Nelson will speak to that point.

Mr. NELSON. To illustrate the point that Mr. Hodges was making, I can refer as examples to two specific areas that are personally known to me. They are areas in east Texas. I have had the opportunity of visiting both areas. As a consequence I have perhaps a little more firsthand knowledge of those projects than I would have of some of the others.

The first one is a project called dam B on the Neches River in east Texas. The information I have on that project is rather detailed, and I will not go into the details concerning it, except to say that it involves, according to the information I have before me, approximately 23,000 acres of land. That dam was completed some years back. A good part of the reservoir area has been cleared of timber. One of the larger timberland owners whose land was taken in part by this reservoir indicated that only about 20 percent of the timber in the area was salvaged insofar as the clearing was concerned. He has indicated that as of the time when I saw the project, which was in 1957, that there were no specific plans then available for the management of the timber resources comprising the area above the pool level.

He stated as follows in that connection, and I quote:

No definite plans have been made by the Corps of Engineers for the management of this some 6,000 acres of land between the upper acquisition line and the pool stage. I have had this understanding directly from the Corps of Engineers employee who had charge of the acquisition and timber estimation.

Mr. McFALL. May I break in just a moment, Mr. Nelson?

According to the figures that General Cassidy has supplied us with reference to dam B, there are 21,751 acres in the total fee—8,051 acres above the normal pool and 6,750 acres suitable for timber production at that particular site.

To your knowledge, of this 6,750 acres there is no present program for development of the forest area. Is that correct?

Mr. NELSON. I would not be able to say "Yes" to that question without qualification. When I saw the area in 1957, there was not any such plan or program. I would be unable to say at this time whether there is one now. The Corps of Engineers could answer that question.

Mr. McFALL. Prior to the purchase of this land for the reservoir purposes, was there an active forest practice program going on in this area?

Mr. NELSON. With regard to at least a major part of such timber lands as were acquired, there was an active timber management program operated by private industry; yes, sir.

Mr. McFALL. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Go ahead, Mr. Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. The second example, and I will try to be brief, relates to the McGee Bend Dam on the Angelina River in east Texas. That dam is presently under construction. It would, when completed, as I understand it, directly inundate 129,000 acres of land, of which 122,000 acres is classified as timberland. Of that 122,000 acres, the

greater part of it, close to 100,000 acres, is presently owned by the farmers, large and small. Various companies, like the Southland Paper Mills, and the Angelina Lumber Co., the Southern Pine & Lumber Co., the Kirby Lumber Corp., International Paper, and I think one or two others, own the bulk of these timberlands. They have been under management now for quite a number of years.

In addition to that, the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture owns in the neighborhood of 28,000 or 30,000 acres also under good management. Those lands I mentioned would all be inundated when the dam is completed. Above the pool level, it is my understanding—and here again it is very difficult to get very accurate information because it seems to vary from time to time when you do request such information—but it is my understanding that there would be some 40,000 additional acres in addition to those 129,000 which would be presumably either acquired directly, or would be leased with respect to certain property rights.

Now, insofar as I know there has been no timber management plan prepared for the timberlands in McGee Bend Dam Reservoir above the pool level. My information is not completely up to date on that score. There may have been some detailed management plans developed that I do not know of. But insofar as a year or two ago is concerned, when we went into this particular project there had been. Then no timber management plans developed for that area.

Mr. SMITH. Any further questions?

Mr. McFALL. No further questions. Thank you, Mr. Nelson and Mr. Hodges.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Cramer.

Mr. CRAMER. No questions.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mack.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Nelson, you proposed an amendment at the end of the bill which provides wherever possible the engineers shall consult with local and public and private interests and the owners of adjacent timber. In the State of Washington I noticed that there are only 2,000 acres involved in seven different projects, 2,000 acres that can be devoted to raising timber.

May I ask whether under your proposed amendment it would be necessary to hold public hearings, or at least consult with all the different groups, local interests and State interests that might own timber, even the tree farmers? Wouldn't the cost of such investigations and hearings be far in excess of the benefits in these areas, particularly where only small bodies of timber are involved?

Mr. NELSON. My interpretation of the amendment we are suggesting would not necessarily require the diligent search for facts with public hearings and matters of that kind that you have suggested, Mr. Mack. We say, "and to the extent possible with local, public and private ownership." That is coordination to the extent possible. Such coordination is particularly essential in the South, where you probably have a little different situation than you have in your own State of Washington.

Mr. MACK. In the southern areas planted to forestry these are much larger than in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. NELSON. I think the location of the dams likewise would have some effect. This is not a mandatory provision. It says to the extent

possible such coordination should take place. Obviously, in some circumstances where, as I mentioned in east Texas at the McGee Bend Dam on the Angelina River, you have that tremendous area of land being taken over by the Government for this dam, which was owned largely by private companies. These companies own much of the land surrounding this reservoir on all sides and in among the tributaries. Obviously, the lands that would be taken over which would not be inundated but which would be under Government ownership and management should be coordinated in the management process with the private and other public lands adjacent to it. In this way there would be proper fire protection, and proper timber management operations coordinated one with the other. Therefore it would seem that our proposal should be of merit both to the Government and to the adjacent owners.

Mr. MACK. In situations such as exist in the State of Washington, where there are seven reservoirs and only about 250 acres in each reservoir that would be devoted to the growth of timber, you would regard the situation as impracticable for the operation of this particular amendment?

Mr. NELSON. Yes. Of course. I think those are largely in farm areas.

Mr. MACK. I asked the previous witness if he believed that one-quarter of the value of the timber sold from such reservoirs as are created here under this bill, from such timber-growing areas as are covered in this bill—if 25 percent of that should not go to the counties for school- and road-building purposes. Would you see any objection to such an amendment?

Mr. NELSON. That is a question we have not considered in connection with this particular legislation, but, Mr. Mack, we do feel as a basic matter of policy that where the Government owns property and the property produces revenue, and particularly if that property is taken off the tax rolls, there should be a payment made to the local government in lieu of taxes.

Mr. MACK. On all forestry timber when sold, 25 percent does go to the counties for highways and schools.

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. MACK. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. BALDWIN. No questions.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. No questions.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Nelson and Mr. Hodges.

Before we proceed further, I would like to ask the committee for permission to insert in the record some communications we have received regarding the bill, and without objection they will be made a part of the record.

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

ALEXANDRIA, LA., February 22, 1960.

HON. FRANK E. SMITH,
Chairman, Watershed Subcommittee, House Committee on Public Works,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Louisiana Forestry Association heartily endorses H.R. 9377. We view this bill as answering minimum needs. This is the least Federal Government can do under conditions existing as result of confiscation of private timberland to

create a public facility. Furthermore, we plead that no further forest land be taken from private landowners for construction of reservoirs giving landowner the option of exchange of land for land or land for dollars. Timber industry is our biggest employer in the South. We need this raw material and we need your help to assure a continuing supply.

C. H. LEWIS, Jr.,

The Louisiana Forestry Association.

FORESTRY SUPPLIERS, INC.,

Jackson, Miss., February 19, 1960.

HON. FRANK SMITH,
*Member of Congress,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: This statement is made in support of your bill No. 9377, scheduled for hearing before the Public Works Subcommittee on February 23 this year.

As State forester of Mississippi from 1952 to 1956, it was my privilege to work very closely with the representatives of the U.S. Corps of Engineers in Mississippi in connection with lands surrounding the flood prevention lakes. At that time there was evidenced a desire for better forest management practices on these lands. It is strongly felt that your legislation will provide both the incentive and the means whereby the Corps of Engineers can adequately perform a satisfactory degree of forest management on these lands and thereby increase the income to the Government and to the State of Mississippi and to the other Southern States from such management.

Nationwide, land held by the Corps of Engineers under the similar situations amounts to many thousands of acres. This land should be under the best possible forest management and should be producing income for the U.S. Government and for the State governments and for individuals who may be working in the growing and harvesting of timber products therefrom.

It is thoroughly practical to conduct this forest management in such a way that it will not detract from the flood prevention function originally held in mind by the Corps of Engineers. In other words the land can be managed on a multiple-use concept that will carry the flood prevention functions, the game management function, the forestry function, the recreational function, all becoming so vitally necessary in today's expanding population and economy.

Yours very truly,

JAMES W. CRAIG,

President and General Manager.

MR. SMITH. Before General Cassidy becomes available for questions, I would like to make available, as a part of the record, a letter to me, and this table which he submitted, of the lands owned and managed by the Corps of Engineers, which would be subject to this proposed bill.

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

FEBRUARY 19, 1960.

HON. FRANK E. SMITH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Further reference is made to your request by telephone on February 4, 1960, concerning federally owned acreage at operating Corps of Engineers' reservoirs and lock and dam projects which is above the normal pools and would be suitable for timber production. Preliminary information on lands owned in fee obtained from records available in this office was delivered to you on February 5, 1960.

Additional information by State and project is attached which shows acreage owned in fee, above the normal pool, and that suitable for timber production. At the time the preliminary information was delivered, it was explained that it was subject to change based upon information to be received from field offices. The attached information involves a number of minor changes which are reflected in the total of federally owned land. A résumé of the inclosed information shows total acreages as follows: fee 3,959,385; above-normal pools 2,057,860; and part of land above-normal pool suitable for timber production 745,564.

In stating that these lands are suitable for timber production it should be understood that while these lands are capable of productive forest cover they may not in all cases be susceptible of sustained yield timber management and production, or properly to be considered as commercial forest lands. The extent to which these lands can be used for timber production can be ascertained only by careful consideration of the specific case. In most cases, however, they can be managed for protection and development of the forest cover.

Some of the lands listed as suitable for timber production are not available for that use as they are presently obligated under leases, permits and other agreements for use of Federal land by others.

As you know reservoir areas have shown their greatest utility and value for recreational use. Consequently, management for improvement and production of timber should be accomplished to the extent practicable and compatible with other project uses.

I understand hearings on H.R. 9377 are to start on February 23, 1960. In accordance with your request and that of the Public Works Committee, I shall be present to provide such information as you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. CASSIDY,
Major General, U.S. Army,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

(Enclosure referred to in letter will be found in H. Rept. 1298, 86th Cong., 2d sess.)

Mr. SMITH. Are there any questions by members of the committee that they would like to propound to General Cassidy, of the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. CRAMER. I have a couple of questions.

Mr. SMITH. Would you come around, please, General?

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM F. CASSIDY, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS FOR CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. CRAMER. General, I would like to ask you what your present policy is in the Corps of Engineers with regard to forestation practices in the areas we are now discussing in this bill.

General CASSIDY. We prepare a reservoir management plan for the management of the reservoir areas for the project purposes. However, that plan does not include the production of commercial timber. But there is a plan for the management of the reservoir area.

Mr. CRAMER. Why does it not seem fit to include that in the plan? Is it beyond your jurisdiction, in your opinion, or is it beyond the purposes of the Corps of Engineers, or what has been the reason?

General CASSIDY. Generally we have managed the lands for recreation, or have tried to outlease them to the people in the local area for commercial use as they see fit. They have always tried to get someone else to manage them for recreation or to lease the lands.

Mr. CRAMER. Would this in any way interfere with the outleasing program which you presently have in effect, that is, this bill as presently drafted?

General CASSIDY. I would say it would apply to those lands primarily which we did not outlease.

Mr. CRAMER. That would be my interpretation. As I understand your letter, you would not have any objection to this bill as such if Congress should determine as a matter of policy it believed that reforestation and forest management should properly as a matter of policy be within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the Corps of Engineers in these specific areas.

General CASSIDY. We have no objection to the bill. However, I believe it should be modified by one proviso, that such development and management—

Mr. CRAMER. Where would that proviso be? Have you a copy of the bill?

General CASSIDY. Section 1, line 3, page 2:

Provided that such development and management shall be accomplished to the extent practicable and compatible with other uses of the project.

Mr. CRAMER. Would you read that more slowly, please, General? "Provided that such development and management" should what?

General CASSIDY (reading):

* * * shall be accomplished to the extent practicable and compatible with other uses of the project.

Mr. CRAMER. That would cover your outleasiug, and so forth?

General CASSIDY. Yes, sir, it would.

Mr. CRAMER. Other accepted uses of this particular 740-some-odd acres we are talking about?

General CASSIDY. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. What you estimate the cost of putting this policy into effect would be?

General CASSIDY. We have not had time yet, sir, to check into this and see what the cost would be. We just heard about it last week.

Mr. CRAMER. In your opinion would the cost be consistent with the actual income that might result from it?

General CASSIDY. Yes, sir. I believe it will because we have management practices on those reservoirs at present, and this would be a small addition to what we are attempting to do right now.

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, it probably would not require substantial personnel increases and other types of cost?

General CASSIDY. No, sir; it should not.

Mr. CRAMER. What in your opinion should the income received

Mr. CRAMER. In your opinion would the cost be consistent with the questions of the gentleman from Washington?

General CASSIDY. I believe that the present law would cover this. Three-fourths of the money would go to the county and one-fourth would go to the Treasury.

Mr. CRAMER. In your opinion then the present law would cover that too?

General CASSIDY. Yes.

Mr. MACK. One-fourth to the county and three-fourths to the Federal Government?

General CASSIDY. Three-fourths to the county and one-fourth to the Federal Government.

Mr. MACK. Under the Army Engineers?

General CASSIDY. Yes.

Mr. MACK. Under the Forest Service it is one-fourth to the county.

General CASSIDY. Under the Army Engineers it is three-fourths to the county.

Mr. CRAMER. Is that on all types of income, presently?

General CASSIDY. Income from the use of the reservoir lands, is leasing of lands. And I would suggest a contract on harvesting timber would be somewhat similar to a lease-type agreement, so that the present law would govern.

Mr. CRAMER. So that the result of this would be three-fourths of the income from this forestation program would go to the local communities?

General CASSIDY. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. And one-quarter to the Federal Government?

General CASSIDY. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. In your opinion, would the one-quarter going to the Federal Government cover the additional cost of this program?

General CASSIDY. I could not make a factual statement on that, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. What is your opinion with regard to the consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture? Do you see any jurisdiction that the Department of the Interior might have in the matter?

General CASSIDY. In our management practices now we do consult with the Secretary of Agriculture or his agents in the field. We consult with Interior when they are concerned, or any of their agencies are concerned, and we consult with the local State agencies. We attempt to do all this in management practices at the present time.

Mr. CRAMER. Then with or without the amendment as proposed by Mr. Hodges, as a matter of present policy you do consult with all local interests involved. Is that correct?

General CASSIDY. Mr. Hodges brought up the consultation with private landowners. This is, I would say, at present something that is done only from time to time, and not as a requirement, because the ownerships are so varied and mixed. I am certain that a large landowner adjacent to a piece of property we are operating would be consulted with respect to fire protection, or things of that sort, but that is not necessarily so at present.

Mr. CRAMER. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mack.

Mr. MACK. General Cassidy, you said three-quarters of the revenues from the lands in these reservoirs go to the local government. By that do you mean the State or the county?

General CASSIDY. The county I believe it is.

Mr. MACK. Is your money earmarked for any specific purpose as it is in the Forestry Service?

General CASSIDY. I believe it is earmarked for schools. I am not certain of that.

Mr. MACK. There is a great deal of controversy as to whether it should or should not be earmarked, but I know the Forest Service does earmark their money for schools and road purposes.

General CASSIDY. I believe ours does.

Mr. MACK. With regard to the last sentence on the first page of the bill, on the last line it refers to operation through sustained yield programs. Is it feasible to operate these forests in such limited areas under sustained yield plans?

General CASSIDY. Only in those areas where we have the use of fairly large blocks of land. Under the acquisition program such as that which applied when the lands were acquired for the four reservoirs in Mississippi there are fairly large blocks of land. But our new acquisition program only acquires in fee simple those lands flooded on an average of once in 5 years. Therefore, most of the reservoir is in easement and we do not note it.

Mr. MACK. In maintaining the sustained yield principle would it not be far more practicable in these areas where only small acreages

are involved, to have that land tied in with nearby private or public owners of the State, and the entire area put under one sustained yield?

General CASSIDY. That is the best way and it is really our policy now, whether it is forest, grazing or agricultural land. We hope it will be leased by some adjacent or nearby land owner who can operate it.

Mr. MACK. Will the planning of the acreage in the reservoir area contribute to holding the moisture and providing for a more even runoff of the water?

General CASSIDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACK. That is a recognized principle?

General CASSIDY. That is correct.

Mr. MACK. Thank you, General.

Mr. BALDWIN. I just have a couple of questions.

General Cassidy, in this program on which you do this outleasing now, do you have any limitations on what the lessee may do with the land, or may he harvest the timber as he sees fit at the present time?

General CASSIDY. As to harvesting timber, I do not know. I think a lease can be written up if we have an area of that type, which could provide for harvesting the timber. But on that particular point I am not familiar with it. The thing that comes to my mind there is that for timber harvesting we would have to have a very long-term lease in order for anyone to take it on and see into the future, so that he can make a profit. I think our leases now run for about 25 years, which would probably not be sufficient for tree farming.

Mr. BALDWIN. One second question. You mentioned that at present you do not maintain these forests from the standpoint of commercial harvesting of timber. But do you do some planting for the purpose of protecting erosion and protecting the flow of earth down into the dam from filling up the lake behind it?

General CASSIDY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. BALDWIN. Thank you.

Mr. MACK. General Cassidy, are the Army Engineers in favor of or in opposition to this legislation?

General CASSIDY. We have no objection to it, sir.

Mr. McFALL. General Cassidy, I was discussing with Mr. Nelson and Mr. Hodges dam B in Texas. According to this table which you provided us, there were some 6,500 acres of timber that would be organized in the conservation areas. Do you have any comment on that, General?

General CASSIDY. I am not familiar with the particular area except I know in our tables there are about 6,000 acres that could be used possibly for timber management.

Mr. McFALL. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Are there any other questions?

Mr. CRAMER. May I ask one other question?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Cramer.

Mr. CRAMER. I did not quite understand your answer to my question as to whether it is presently believed that you have authority to enter into a reforestation program such as the one we are discussing in Texas.

General CASSIDY. I believe the existing authorities are broad enough so that we possibly could, but this involves asking for funds, that is, asking Congress for funds for this particular purpose. So it would

be much, much better if we had legislation if we want to go into this program so we could justify the request for funds for this purpose.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much.

We have a representative of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Warren T. Murphy.

Do you have a statement, Mr. Murphy?

STATEMENT OF WARREN T. MURPHY, CHIEF, DIVISION OF FLOOD PREVENTION AND RIVER BASIN PROGRAMS, FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MURPHY. I do not have a statement, Mr. Chairman and committee members. Actually I am here from the U.S. Forest Service, and Mr. George Phillips is representing the Department of Agriculture.

There was a previous question with regard to the type of timber that can be grown in this area. I have a photograph here showing a plantation in 1958. The picture was taken in 1958. It was made not very far from one of those reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers. I might pass this photograph around for the committee to see just what you developed in that period.

In that particular plantation the owner was about to make a thinning for a pulpwood cutting. It will give you a good idea of what can be grown on that eroded land.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Mr. CRAMER. Is the Forest Service in favor of this legislation?

Mr. MURPHY. The Department has not yet cleared its statement and I do not know at this point just what the outcome would be. I can say this: That in the past the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service have cooperated with the Corps of Engineers in doing work around some of those reservoirs in the Yazoo-Tallahatchie area.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Phillips, do you have anything directly that you want to submit from the Department?

STATEMENT OF GEORGE PHILLIPS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Unfortunately the Department's official position has not been cleared, Mr. Chairman. However, the Department does feel it is important to use reservoir lands in accordance with their capabilities in order to protect them from eroding and to maintain them as stable watershed lands for the protection of reservoirs to which they are tributary. It does feel too that there would be an advantage from the standpoint of provisions of this bill since it is nationwide in its application, somewhat to broaden its terms to include not only the use in forestry, but also other vegetative and conservation measures in order to insure the proper use of proper conservation measures suitable to any given situation.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Phillips.

Mr. BALDWIN. Could I ask a question?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. BALDWIN. I want to ask if your Department feels that it should so be broadened, then is the Department going to submit some language so that we can actually see what you have in mind specifically in modification of this bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think we can do it. They had in mind just a general suggestion that would do that.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I take it that would come in when your Department submits a report on the bill. When would we expect that?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Just as soon as it can be cleared, sir. It is in the final stages.

Mr. BALDWIN. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Phillips.

We have representatives of the Department of the Interior here. Mr. Mitchell, the Assistant Chief.

Mr. Mitchell.

STATEMENT OF DONALD S. MITCHELL, JR., ASSISTANT CHIEF, DIVISION OF IRRIGATION AND LAND USE, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION; ACCOMPANIED BY WALTER H. HORNING, FORESTRY STAFF OFFICER, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MITCHELL. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Interior report has not been cleared and I am unable to give you the official views of the Department, but I will be happy to make one or two suggestions that we consider are necessary in the bill, or would be advisable, at least.

One matter concerns us regarding the definition of "reservoir area." Just what does that encompass? I think, as General Cassidy pointed out, it is the land acquisition program policy of the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army to acquire only the lands needed for the reservoir in fee simple title for the conservation space. With that limit the amount of land acquired under each reservoir could be a point of contention as to exactly what is meant by the language of the bill.

For clarification purposes, may I refer to our program in the Bureau of Reclamation which operates in 17 Western States. In a number of instances we may withdraw from the public lands a certain block of land which would be somewhat larger than we would need for the ultimate program. But our question involves whether or not this definition of reservoir area would encompass all of those lands. Does this mean a quarter of a mile back from the reservoir, 1 mile back, or 5 miles back, or what is the limitation of the boundaries? And we would like to suggest that you give consideration to clarifying that point.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Mitchell.

Is there any discussion?

Mr. CRAMER. What language in the bill do you think needs clarification?

Mr. MITCHELL. The bill starts out that it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to provide that reservoir areas are projects for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development,

and so forth. Reservoir areas. What does that mean? Does that mean just the reservoir and the portion that is inundated by the water? That is usually spoken of as the reservoir area. It is that portion inundated. But do we have something else in mind? Does it involve the land that goes back 300 feet, or 500 feet, or half a mile, or some other definition?

I think it would be well to consider defining how much area we are talking about.

Mr. CRAMER. It is pretty clear in the report that the Army Engineers submitted that they are talking about an area that they actually own, and that area that is not inundated.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that mean the area that an agency owns on each and every project?

Mr. CRAMER. The area it owns in fee, as I understand it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Owns in fee?

Mr. CRAMER. That is right.

Mr. MITCHELL. On each and every project?

Mr. CRAMER. Would it clarify it for you—

Mr. MITCHELL. That might involve lands 25, 50, or 75 miles from a reservoir.

Mr. CRAMER. What is your objection to their making proper use of that land if it is owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. MITCHELL. No objection. I think it just should be clear and clarified that it would be all of the land owned by an agency in the project, or some other clarifying language.

Mr. CRAMER. In lines 3 and 4 on page 1 it says:

That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to provide that reservoir areas * * *.

If it said "owned in fee by the Federal Government," if that were included, would that clarify it?

Mr. MITCHELL. Would that mean only land right in the reservoir owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. CRAMER. Does the Department of the Interior own land in the area?

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. CRAMER. Immediately adjoining, or what?

Mr. MITCHELL. Immediately adjoining, and sometimes 25 miles away from that particular reservoir.

Mr. CRAMER. It is pretty clearly understood, though, that when you talk about flood control, navigation and hydroelectric power development, and other related purposes under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, that you are limiting it to land owned by the Army Engineers or by the Federal Government for these purposes, is it not?

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement here, if you will yield?

Mr. CRAMER. If he could just answer that question. Could you answer my question?

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I do not pretend to speak for the Corps of Engineers, but I am sure that they own land on a project that might be many miles from the reservoir itself.

Mr. CRAMER. How does that involve the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MITCHELL. Under this present bill it does not involve us at all.

Mrs. BLITCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the lady.

Mrs. BLITCH. May I point out a situation in my own district to give you an idea of that? In the Okefenokee Swamp, which is controlled by the Department of the Interior, we have the St. Marys River and the Suwanee River both rising in the Okefenokee Swamp. We are just in the status of the completion of a project in the Okefenokee Swamp building fire protection roads, and also building low-level dams which contain water during periods of great drought when the swamp has been burnt over very seriously, and also where fire is going from the swamp into the Savannah forest lands. There is an authorization for the Corps of Engineers to do a survey on the Suwanee River and the St. Marys River, but there have been no funds provided for that project as yet. I can see where the fee could be, or where there could be a conflict of interest there very easily, because both rivers rise on Interior Department land and from the time they rise, especially the St. Marys, it would never get much more than the distance that has been talked about here in this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. But I assume that within the Corps of Engineers set-up if the Congress authorized the project there would be a clear delineation as to what jurisdiction and ownership would remain in the Army Engineers, and what should remain in the Department of the Interior.

Mrs. BLITCH. The authorization has already been made for the survey.

Mr. CRAMER. But not for the project itself.

Mrs. BLITCH. No. Just for the survey.

Mr. CRAMER. When the project itself is authorized then there will be a clear delineation of what the ownership interest is in the Army Engineers and the Interior Department, respectively; isn't that correct?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. There is no conflict between Interior and the Department of the Army under this bill. We are merely pointing this out because we think that it will be a problem at some time.

Mr. CRAMER. Don't you think that matter can be clarified in the report on the bill?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, it could be.

Mr. CRAMER. Do you believe that the Department of the Interior has any other interest or any other reason for being consulted in this matter as suggested by Mr. Hodges through the amendment that he proposed?

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, as you know, we have in the Bureau of Reclamation alone today 170-some-odd reservoirs under our jurisdiction, which is a sizable program in itself, and we are naturally interested in the full development of all of the resources, and we are interested in any legislation that would be—

Mr. CRAMER. That is true, but you would not come under the definition of the act as it is contained on page 1, where it is under the jurisdiction of the Army Engineers.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. There would have to be an amendment to include you in this total program.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Otherwise you have no interest in it.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. MACK. Does the Department of the Interior, Mr. Mitchell, at the present time carry out similar forest programs as are asked to be given to the U.S. Army Engineers by this legislation?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, sir, we do. Generally our lands, if they are withdrawn from the public domain, remain in the custody of the Bureau of Land Management, who have a program for management, and which Mr. Horning, I am sure, will touch on.

Mr. MACK. Then this program, Mr. Mitchell, would merely give to the Army Engineers authority that is now being exercised by the Interior Department over their own reservoirs that they are operating?

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that is correct. Yes.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question, please?

Mr. SMITH. Mrs. Pfof.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Mitchell, what practices are you using today on your reservoir-withdrawn lands on your irrigation projects?

Mr. MITCHELL. As you know, Mrs. Pfof, most of those reservoirs, or the majority of them anyway, are in an arid area, and many of those are not subject to forestry practices. But we have erosion control, and vegetative programs, on each and every one of those reservoirs, in order to revegetate the surrounding areas in order to eliminate erosion and carry sediment down into the reservoir areas. On those reservoirs where forestry practices are possible, either the program under the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture is carrying out practices connected with forestry.

Mrs. PFOST. But the Bureau of Reclamation does not proceed with any type of reforestation, conservation practices such as reseeding or flanking practices in the withdrawn reservoir, irrigation areas?

Mr. MITCHELL. No, Madam. We do all the conservation work in cooperation with the colleges and the Bureau of Land Management and the Erosion Service. We do no forest work. It is done either by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Mrs. PFOST. In speaking about your uncertain feelings about an amendment to this legislation, would it serve your purpose if the language were clarified to say, "Lands withdrawn for reservoir sites," and enumerate these other cases so it excludes the areas you speak about, about 25 to 50 miles away?

Mr. MITCHELL. That would help to clarify it.

Mrs. PFOST. It would be difficult.

Mr. MITCHELL. That would help to clarify it.

Mr. SMITH. At that point I would like to understand this. I do not know what the concern is about it being 50 miles away. If it is 50 miles away and was owned by the Corps of Engineers, I do not know of any such instances, but why should there be a management of it under this type of program? What if it were 1,000 miles away?

Mrs. PFOST. I have no objection to it, Mr. Chairman. I think it is a good practice, certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would it not be all of the land under the jurisdiction of that agency within that project?

Mr. CRAMER. That is owned in fee.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is right. It would not be reservoir area lands, but all lands.

Mr. SMITH. Relating to that project.

Mr. MITCHELL. Right.

Mr. SMITH. I do not think you will have any trouble on that point, Mr. Mitchell.

Thank you very much, Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Horning, do you have any statement?

Mr. HORNING. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a prepared statement. I have come to answer any questions regarding the interests of land management in this matter. Does anyone have any questions to ask?

Mr. CRAMER. The only question I have is that the present form of the bill is satisfactory with you, is it not, although the Department of the Interior is not required to be consulted?

Mr. HORNING. Yes. We have no objections to the provisions of this bill. We think that the stated purposes are very laudable.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Horning.

If the members have no further amendments, we will now meet in a brief executive session.

(Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the committee concluded its open hearings and went into executive session.)

×

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
Public Law 86-717
H. R. 9377

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 9377	.1
Digest of Public Law 86-717	.2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 9377

Jan. 6, 1960	Rep. Smith, Miss., introduced H. R. 9377 which was referred to the House Public Works Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Feb. 24, 1960	House committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 9377.
Mar. 1, 1960	House committee reported H. R. 9377 with amendments. H. Report No. 1298. Print of bill and report.
Mar. 7, 1960	House passed H. R. 9377 as reported.
Mar. 8, 1960	H. R. 9377 was referred to the Senate Public Works Committee. Print of bill as referred.
Aug. 16, 1960	Senate committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 9377.
Aug. 18, 1960	Senate committee reported H. R. 9377 without amendment. S. Report No. 1842. Print of bill and report.
Aug. 19, 1960	Senate passed over H. R. 9377.
Aug. 25, 1960	Senate passed H. R. 9377 without amendment.
Sept. 6, 1960	Approved: Public Law 86-717.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 86-717

PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER ON ARMY RESERVOIR AREAS. Declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide that reservoir areas owned in fee under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage, promote, and assure adequate and dependable future resources of readily available timber, through sustained yield programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation practices. Provides that programs and policies developed by the Chief of Engineers with respect to protection and development of forest or other vegetative cover, and maintenance of other conservation measures on reservoir areas, shall be coordinated with the Secretary of Agriculture and appropriate State agencies.

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 9377

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 6, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United
4 States to provide that reservoir areas of projects for flood
5 control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and
6 other related purposes under the jurisdiction of the Secre-
7 tary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers shall be de-
8 veloped and maintained so as to encourage, promote, and
9 assure fully adequate and dependable future resources of
10 readily available timber, through sustained yield programs,

1 reforestation, and accepted conservation practices, and to
2 increase the value of such areas for conservation, recrea-
3 tion, and other beneficial uses.

4 SEC. 2. In order to carry out the national policy de-
5 clared in the first section of this Act, the Chief of Engineers,
6 under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, shall
7 provide for the protection and development of forest cover
8 of reservoir areas under his jurisdiction, so as to yield the
9 maximum benefit and otherwise improve such areas. Pro-
10 grams and policies developed pursuant to the preceding
11 sentence shall be coordinated with the Secretary of Agri-
12 culture, and with appropriate State conservation agencies.

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 9377

A BILL

To provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi

JANUARY 6, 1960

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

Feb 24 1960

HOUSE

14. FORESTS. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 9377, to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. p. D142
15. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. In reporting this bill, H. R. 10569 (see Digest 30), the report of the Appropriations Committee includes the following statement:

"Annualization" Increases

"The budgets for certain agencies in this bill, especially the Internal Revenue Service, contained sizable increases over the current year for the specific purpose of placing on a full-year basis in 1961 certain activities accelerated during fiscal 1960 with increased appropriations granted in the 1960 bill. In certain instances, these increases were identified as 'annualization' of activities financed for only a portion of fiscal 1960 and were so justified. In other instances, 'annualization' costs were not clearly identified, making it more difficult to arrive at the exact magnitude of these built-in cost increases.

"Accordingly, and for reasons set forth in general terms in its recent report No. 1247, the Committee desires that those having responsibility for planning and budgeting undertake to follow the general rule of avoiding the 'annualization' practice."

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

16. CONSERVATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley commending a Waupaca, Wis., school program, designed for rural teachers, and aimed at promoting creative efforts in utilization, as well as preservation, of our soil, lands, forest, and other natural resources. p. A1523
17. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Pelly inserted additional comments by his constituents opposing price support programs. pp. A1523-4
18. PERSONNEL. Sen. Keating commended and inserted an editorial favoring the "idea of passing a comprehensive new conflict-of-interest statute." pp. A1525-6
19. FORESTS. Sen. Wiley inserted a resume of the progress in utilization as well as preservation of the Nicolet National Forest in Wisc. during the 1950's. pp. A1528-9

BILLS INTRODUCED

20. FEED GRAINS. S. 3087, by Sen. McCarthy, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a proper relationship between wheat, corn, grain sorghum, and other feeds on a proper feed unit basis, to bring supply and demand into balance, and to assist American agriculture in essential adjustment during the years 1960, 1961, and 1962, and to provide for a permanent farm program thereafter; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.
21. POULTRY. S. 3089, by Sen. Ellender (by request), to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

Feb 24, 1960

"The committee is aware that proposed legislation relating to this matter has again been requested. It is the sense of the committee that budget estimates in accordance with law be submitted after action upon these proposals (authorizing appropriations from the highway trust fund); or in the event such action is not forthcoming it is expected that a budget estimate will be submitted to this session of the Congress (providing for general fund appropriations)."

National Bureau of Standards

***"Research and technical services (special foreign currency program). The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,030,000 for this activity. This is an increase of \$1,030,000 over the House bill and a reduction of \$3,970,000 from the budget estimate.

"The committee recommendation for a considerably lesser amount than the amount proposed in the budget was dictated in large part by a desire to see the results which could be obtained on the basis of a pilot program of considerably smaller scope than the \$5 million level proposed in the budget. The committee was told that the projects selected will closely supplement existing programs, will supply data or experimental results that are needed currently or will be needed in the near future, and will draw upon the known competence of specific scientists and research groups.

"The sum of \$1,030,000 recommended by the committee will be available only to purchase currencies from the Treasury Department for the special program and the dollar proceeds of such sales will go to the Commodity Credit Corporation. This sum will reduce the amount of the appropriation otherwise required to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its losses. The budget totals of new obligational authority and expenditures are not affected by this recommendation."

Weather Bureau

***"The committee recognizes the growing need for agricultural weather forecasting, and the Mississippi Delta weather project clearly illustrates the benefits that can be obtained from this type of program. A 10-county survey, made by the Mississippi Extension Service indicates that \$1,100,000 were saved by weather forecasts which prevented premature planting; and over \$800,000 were saved by timely weather information that assisted farmers in application of agricultural chemicals. Potential gains to agriculture through these studies and forecasts are most encouraging, and the committee recommends \$75,000 for this program in 1961. This is an increase of \$27,000 over the current year to strengthen this program and permit weather information to be relayed to 11 north Louisiana parishes."

12. PRICE SUPPORTS; INTEREST RATES. Sen. Carlson inserted a Highland Farmers Union Local, Kan., resolution favoring enactment of "emergency legislation to pull farm prices up to not less than 100 percent parity price supports," urging that "farm policies should be directed to the preservation of the family size farm," and also urging that "high interest rates be reduced." pp. 3041-2
13. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Chavez contended that "the Nation has steadily fallen behind in providing the sewage treatment necessary to protect its vital water resources," and he and other Senators urged that the President's veto be overridden on H. R. 3610, to increase Federal Grants for construction of sewage treatment works and to establish the Office of Water Pollution Control. pp. 3086-98

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued March 2, 1960
For actions of March 1, 1960
86th-2d, No. 37

Accounting.....	12
Appropriations.....	19
Electrification.....	10
Farm program.....	14
Flood relief.....	7
Forestry.....	2, 9, 16, 19
Hawaii.....	5
Highways.....	4
Industrial uses.....	1
Interest rates.....	3, 11
Lands.....	9
Military construction....	6
Personnel.....	17
Property.....	20

Records.....	8	Soil bank.....	18
Research.....	1, 9	Sugar.....	13
Roads.....	19	Textiles.....	12

HIGHLIGHTS: Rep. Abernethy urged enactment of the industrial-uses research bill.

HOUSE

1. RESEARCH. Rep. Abernethy urged consideration by the Senate of S. 690, as amended by the House, the industrial-uses research bill to create an Agricultural and Development Commission, stated that "In recent weeks rumors came to me that the bill does not have the support of the Department of Agriculture," and inserted a letter from Assistant Secretary Peterson stating that this Department does favor the enactment of this bill as passed by the House.
pp. 3666-7
2. FORESTS. The Public Works Committee reported, with amendment, H. R. 9377, to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers (H. Rept. 1298)
p. 3672
3. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Patman attacked the Federal Reserve as being able to "make interest rates at whatever level it wishes," and having raised rates "much too high for the good of the country." pp. 3668-71
4. HIGHWAYS. Received a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting the Fourth Annual Report on the "Financial Condition and Fiscal Operations of the Highway Trust Fund" (H. Doc. 351). p. 3672
5. HAWAII. Received a memorial from the Legislature of the State of Hawaii requesting favorable consideration of H. R. 10443, to amend certain laws of the U. S. in the light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.
p. 3673

6. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Armed Services Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) a clean bill, H.R. 10777 (in lieu of H. R. 10220), to authorize appropriations for military construction. p. D170
7. FLOOD RELIEF. The Judiciary Committee voted to report (but did not actually report), H. R. 5726, for the relief of Hood County, Texas, a flood relief disaster area. p. D161
8. AGENCY RECORDS. The Judiciary Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7847, to make the law relating to the record on review of agency orders applicable to the judicial review of orders issued under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. p. D161

SENATE

9. LANDS; FORESTRY. Sen. McClellan submitted an amendment to the civil rights bill to include the text of S. 1617, to permit Federal agencies to restore to the States certain jurisdictional authority now vested in the U. S., which may better be administered by State authorities, and to acquire only such jurisdiction as may be necessary in connection with future land procurement. p. 3638
Sen. Murray inserted the statement of Sen. Gruening before the Subcommittee on Interior of the Senate Appropriations Committee urging additional funds for forest research and to "enable the Secretary of Agriculture's program for the national forests to keep on schedule," and for the Bureau of Land Management, Interior, to make a survey of land in Alaska. pp. 3685-7

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hoeven inserting a letter from David Hamil, Administrator of REA, and stating that "it presents a record of real progress and achievement on which he and the REA cooperatives of the country are to be congratulated." p. A1763
Extension of remarks of Rep. McCormack inserting an address by Rep. Albert pointing out "justification for the legislation enacted in past years relating to rural electrification, and for the continuation and strengthening of the same." pp. A1763-5
11. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Johnson, Wisc., inserted a resolution adopted by the National Rural Electric Co-op Assn. urging Congress to defeat legislation which would raise the interest rate ceiling on Government bonds. p. A1777
12. TEXTILES. Rep. Whitener inserted an editorial which criticized a speech made by the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs in the Commerce Department in which the Assistant Secretary stated "the position of the present administration concerning textile imports." pp. A1765-6
13. SUGAR. Rep. Anfuso inserted an article by W. R. Hearst, Jr., calling for action on a bill introduced by Rep. Anfuso which would cut Cuba's sugar quota by any amount they sell to U. S. S. R. and redistribute it to friendly Latin American sugar producers.
14. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Pelly inserted a number of comments he had received which he states "strongly indict present acreage and price supports and call for a return to the law of supply and demand such as is contained in the provision of my farm bill H. R. 10350." pp. A1777-8

PROVIDING FOR THE PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR RESERVOIR AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY AND THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

MARCH 1, 1960.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 9377]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 9377) to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "purposes", insert the following:
owned in fee and

Page 2, line 3, strike the period and insert a semicolon in lieu thereof and the following:

provided that such development and management shall be accomplished to the extent practicable and compatible with other uses of the project.

Page 2, line 7, after the word "forest" insert the following:
or other vegetative

Page 2, line 8, strike the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof
and the establishment and maintenance of other conservation measures on

The purpose of the first amendment is to make clear the fact that the part of the reservoir areas which come within the purposes of the bill are only those which are owned in fee title and do not include

areas on which the Corps of Engineers has secured flowage easements or areas adjacent to the reservoir but not part of the project.

The purpose of the second amendment which was suggested by representatives of the Corps of Engineers is to make certain that certain that reservoir management with respect to forest cover shall not interfere with the authorized project uses.

The purpose of the last two amendments is to broaden the scope of the bill to include other vegetative cover and to insure the establishment and maintenance of other conservation measures. These amendments were suggested by representatives of the Department of Agriculture.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 9377 is to insure that areas of Corps of Engineers reservoir projects owned in fee title shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage the preservation of forest resources and to apply accepted conservation practices to these areas.

The bill would provide for a much needed improvement in the management of those forest reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The total acreage owned in fee title in Corps of Engineers projects amounts to nearly 4 million acres, of which approximately 2 million acres are above the normal pool level. These 2 million acres are in many cases suitable for development. According to information furnished the committee, approximately 750,000 of these acres are suitable for timber production.

Reforestation practice on suitable land has long been recognized as a desirable goal in the conservation of natural resources. The establishment of sustained yield practices in timberlands throughout the country, both public and private, has grown in extent in recent years and is recognized to be a desirable, necessary tool in the protection of one of the most important national resources of the United States.

The bill, H.R. 9377, would provide two major steps in this direction. It would insure the development of lands owned in fee title in Corps of Engineers reservoir projects so as to encourage and promote sustained yield programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation practices. The second step would be the provision of general reservoir management so as to produce the maximum benefit. These programs and policies would be developed in coordination with the Secretary of Agriculture and with appropriate State conservation agencies. The committee has included among other amendments the provision that such management and development shall be compatible with other uses of the project.

Specifically, the problem concerns itself with proper land utilization of those parts of the reservoir area not subject to annual overflow. Much of the land in some reservoirs is in seriously eroded condition. Runoff from heavy rains on the steep slopes creates gullies and carries silt into the main body of the reservoir, which increases the sedimentation problem, reduces the life of the reservoir, and thus impairs the effectiveness of projects which represent many millions of dollars of the taxpayers' investment.

The Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service working with the U.S. Forest Service have undertaken reforestation and conservation work in certain lands. However, the acreage that has been reforested has been small and little new work of this kind has been initiated in recent years. Specific authorization for this work would permit the corps to include in budget estimates definite amounts to be used for this program.

One important result would arise from the fact that suitable management of the Corps of Engineers land would serve as an example to private owners and would thus benefit the general economy by increasing the return from the sale of forest produce.

The committee believes that the bill will provide both the incentive and the means whereby the Corps of Engineers can adequately perform satisfactory forest management on lands owned in fee and thereby increase the income to the Government.

HEARINGS

The committee held hearings on this bill on February 23, 1960, at which representatives of conservation interests and Federal agencies were heard.

Representatives of the Mississippi Forestry Association, the American Forestry Association, and the National Lumber Manufacturers Association appeared on behalf of the non-Federal interests. The Federal agencies which are represented were the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of the Interior.

All of the Federal and non-Federal agencies were favorable to the purpose of the bill.

FEDERAL COST

According to testimony at the hearing, the value of the sustained yield and other conservation practices would offset any cost which might be involved in planning or administering the program. In fact, the committee is of the opinion that such a cost would be negligible whereas the value of the program would be considerable.

LANDS AFFECTED

A summary and a detailed breakdown by projects and States of the lands involved are given in the following tabulation. The lands for each project and State are shown as to the total owned in fee title, the area above the normal pool elevation, and the portion that would be suitable for timber production.

The acreages which are listed in the tabulation as being suitable for timber production may not in all cases be capable of sustained yield and timber management production or even properly to be considered as commercial forest lands. However, in all cases they can be managed for production and development of forest lands which will be beneficial from the standpoint of erosion control, recreation, and wild-life conservation. The committee also realizes that some of the lands recognized as being suitable for timber production are presently obligated under leases, permits, or other agreements.

PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR RESERVOIR AREAS

Summary of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation

State	Land area in acres			State	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production		Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Alabama.....	9,500	4,500	1,000	Nebraska.....	45,848	23,084	7,500
Alaska.....	0	0	0	Nevada.....	1,530	1,530	0
Arizona.....	11,565	11,565	0	New Hampshire.....	10,104	9,764	6,830
Arkansas.....	258,874	154,123	71,468	New Jersey.....	0	0	0
California.....	50,045	39,075	0	New Mexico.....	15,315	5,721	0
Colorado.....	27,555	17,775	0	New York.....	10,000	1,775	650
Connecticut.....	2,520	25,200	1,760	North Carolina.....	27,340	15,100	11,500
Delaware.....	0	0	0	North Dakota.....	471,211	75,653	0
Florida.....	17,189	5,900	5,800	Ohio.....	27,513	14,850	10,900
Georgia.....	241,439	130,639	112,400	Oklahoma.....	367,331	250,002	0
Hawaii.....	0	0	0	Oregon.....	44,701	15,880	7,030
Idaho.....	10,461	4,238	338	Pennsylvania.....	26,173	20,615	8,156
Illinois.....	78,175	31,816	18,392	Rhode Island.....	0	0	0
Indiana.....	7,505	6,105	0	South Carolina.....	50,710	33,410	26,800
Iowa.....	69,305	41,447	20,652	South Dakota.....	124,786	30,392	400
Kansas.....	45,670	31,847	4,000	Tennessee.....	112,946	52,951	51,950
Kentucky.....	129,462	64,404	58,400	Texas.....	365,643	190,799	100,400
Louisiana.....	32,498	0	29,000	Utah.....	0	0	0
Maine.....	0	0	0	Vermont.....	1,297	1,297	910
Maryland.....	1,070	294	164	Virginia.....	90,827	52,350	39,900
Massachusetts.....	11,532	10,972	7,040	Washington.....	40,177	13,048	2,264
Michigan.....	0	0	0	West Virginia.....	33,603	28,730	24,000
Minnesota.....	24,064	4,015	53	Wisconsin.....	31,214	6,334	2,268
Mississippi.....	262,601	187,100	81,800	Wyoming.....	0	0	0
Missouri.....	180,086	90,560	31,839				
Montana.....	590,000	353,000	0	Total.....	3,959,385	2,057,860	745,564

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation

ALABAMA

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Demopolis lock and dam.....	8,700	3,700	1,000
Warrior lock and dam.....	800	800	0
Total.....	9,500	4,500	1,000

ALASKA ¹¹ None.

ARIZONA

Painted Rock.....	11,565	11,565	0
-------------------	--------	--------	---

ARKANSAS

Bull Shoals.....	65,352	34,885	15,451
Norfolk.....	49,269	29,195	13,463
Blakely Mountain.....	82,400	42,300	25,000
Blue Mountain.....	17,082	16,990	6,569
Narrows Dam.....	16,200	8,900	4,000
Nimrod.....	25,147	21,291	5,906
Bayou Bodcau.....	1,148	0	1,000
Table Rock.....	2,276	562	379
Total.....	258,874	154,123	71,468

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

CALIFORNIA

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
North Fork.....	613	400	0
Isabella.....	16,427	11,000	0
Pine Flat.....	13,004	9,700	0
Brea.....	237	237	0
Fullerton.....	139	139	0
Whittier Narrows.....	2,613	2,613	0
Lake Englebright.....	1,716	1,500	0
San Antonio.....	369	369	0
Hansen.....	1,464	1,344	0
Prado.....	6,242	6,242	0
Sepulveda.....	2,097	2,097	0
Santa Fe.....	1,853	1,853	0
Lopez.....	101	101	0
Lake Mendocino.....	3,170	1,480	0
Total.....	50,045	39,075	0

COLORADO

John Martin Dam.....	21,775	12,775	0
Cherry Creek Dam.....	5,780	5,000	0
Total.....	27,555	17,775	0

CONNECTICUT

Mansfield Hollow.....	2,520	25,200	1,760
-----------------------	-------	--------	-------

DELAWARE ¹¹ None.

FLORIDA

Jim Woodruff.....	16,600	5,900	5,800
Lake Okeechobee Waterway project.....	589		0
Total.....	17,189	5,900	5,800

GEORGIA

Allatoona.....	38,000	26,000	24,000
Buford.....	56,300	18,300	17,000
Clark Hill.....	111,800	73,800	59,200
Jim Woodruff.....	35,300	12,500	12,200
New Savannah Bluff, irrigation and drainage.....	39	39	0
Total.....	241,439	130,639	112,400

HAWAII ¹¹ None.

IDAHO

Lucky Peak.....	6,450	3,600	0
Albeni Falls.....	4,011	638	338
Total.....	10,461	4,238	338

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

ILLINOIS

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Farmdale.....	679	679	500
Fon Du Lac.....	137	137	0
Illinois and Mississippi Canal.....	3,825	2,793	0
Illinois Waterway.....	200	200	0
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	73,129	27,802	17,892
Ohio River locks and dams.....	205	205	0
Total.....	78,175	31,816	18,392

INDIANA

Cagles Mill.....	7,300	5,900	0
Ohio River locks and dams.....	205	205	0
Total.....	7,505	6,105	0

IOWA

Coralville.....	24,119	19,219	6,000
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	45,186	22,228	14,662
Total.....	69,305	41,447	20,652

KANSAS

Kanopolis.....	21,243	12,943	4,000
Fall River.....	15,147	12,547	0
Hulah.....	830	707	0
Toronto.....	8,450	5,650	0
Total.....	45,670	31,847	4,000

KENTUCKY

Dewey Reservoir.....	12,200	11,100	10,000
Dale Hollow.....	9,306	4,400	4,400
Lake Cumberland.....	91,667	44,331	44,000
Rough River.....	9,235	4,135	0
Ohio River locks and dams.....	475	438	0
Green and Barron Rivers, irrigation and drainage.....	179	0	0
Kentucky River locks and dams.....	233	0	0
Total.....	129,462	64,404	58,400

LOUISIANA

Bayou Bodcau.....	32,498	0	29,000
-------------------	--------	---	--------

MAINE¹

¹ None.

MARYLAND

Youghiogheny.....	1,070	294	164
-------------------	-------	-----	-----

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

MASSACHUSETTS

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Tully.....	1,310	1,310	910
Knightville.....	2,430	2,430	1,700
Hodges Village.....	882	882	90
Birch Hill.....	4,396	4,396	3,080
East Brimfield.....	1,469	1,109	780
Buffumville.....	488	288	90
Barre Falls.....	557	557	390
Total.....	11,532	10,972	7,040

MICHIGAN ¹¹ None.

MINNESOTA

Orwell.....	1,984	875	0
Lac Qui Parle.....	576	350	0
Mississippi River headwaters reservoirs.....	1,927	783	53
Lake Traverse and Bois De Sioux.....	812	152	0
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	18,765	1,855	0
Total.....	24,064	4,015	53

MISSISSIPPI

Arkabutla.....	36,070	24,200	5,800
Enid.....	43,454	30,400	11,000
Grenada.....	84,677	56,400	27,000
Sardis.....	98,400	76,100	38,000
Total.....	262,601	187,100	81,800

MISSOURI

Table Rock.....	56,953	14,067	9,486
Osage lock and dam.....	10	0	0
Clearwater.....	18,947	16,992	11,121
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	18,024	4,746	1,188
Wappapello.....	44,450	32,200	0
Bull Shoals.....	36,731	19,610	8,686
Norfolk.....	4,971	2,945	1,358
Total.....	180,086	90,560	31,839

MONTANA

Fort Peck.....	590,000	353,000	0
----------------	---------	---------	---

NEBRASKA

Harlan County.....	31,060	17,460	7,500
Gavins Point.....	14,788	5,624	0
Total.....	45,848	23,084	7,500

NEVADA

Mathews Canyon.....	800	800	0
Pine Canyon.....	730	730	0
Total.....	1,530	1,530	0

8 PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR RESERVOIR AREAS

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Franklin Falls.....	3,640	3,640	2,730
Surry Mountain.....	1,688	1,448	1,110
Edward McDowell.....	1,172	1,072	110
Blackwater.....	3,604	3,604	2,880
Total.....	10,104	9,764	6,830

NEW JERSEY¹¹ None.

NEW MEXICO

Jemez Canyon.....	2,831	2,831	0
Conchas Dam.....	12,484	2,890	0
Total.....	15,315	5,721	0

NEW YORK

Almond.....	787	298	100
Arkport.....	327	135	50
East Sidney.....	402	0	0
Mount Morris.....	3,821	19	0
Whitney Point.....	4,663	1,323	500
Total.....	10,000	1,775	650

NORTH CAROLINA

John H. Kerr.....	27,340	15,100	11,500
-------------------	--------	--------	--------

NORTH DAKOTA

Homme.....	395	199	0
Garrison.....	463,000	73,000	0
Baldhill.....	7,816	2,454	0
Total.....	471,211	75,653	0

OKLAHOMA

Canton.....	19,797	12,077	0
Denison.....	134,948	77,586	0
Fort Gibson.....	74,586	55,486	0
Fort Supply.....	8,089	6,289	0
Great Salt Plains.....	31,935	21,235	0
Heyburn.....	7,314	6,244	0
Hulah.....	20,704	17,627	0
Tenkiller Ferry.....	30,777	18,277	0
Wister.....	39,181	35,181	0
Total.....	367,331	250,002	0

OHIO

West Fork, Mill Creek.....	1,280	1,097	0
Mosquito Creek.....	11,181	3,331	2,300
Delaware.....	7,850	6,550	6,000
Berlin.....	6,930	3,680	2,600
Ohio River locks and dams.....	272	192	0
Total.....	27,513	14,850	10,900

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

OREGON

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Cottage Grove.....	1,571	440	0
Dorena.....	2,465	770	0
Fern Ridge.....	11,532	2,220	0
Lookout Point.....	9,642	4,340	3,400
McNary.....	8,271	2,241	0
Bonneville.....	1,019	636	230
Detroit.....	7,247	4,000	3,400
The Dalles.....	2,954	1,233	0
Total.....	44,701	15,880	7,030

PENNSYLVANIA

Youghiogheny.....	2,844	780	436
Prompton.....	539	63	0
Crooked Creek.....	2,564	2,214	700
Mahoning Creek.....	2,533	2,363	1,600
Loyalhanna Creek.....	3,335	3,125	1,700
Tionesta Creek.....	2,797	2,370	1,000
Conemaugh.....	7,671	7,371	3,200
Bear Creek.....	1,803	432	0
East Branch, Clarion River.....	287	140	0
Indian Rock.....	1,644	1,644	120
Ohio River locks and dams.....	38	29	0
Allegheny River locks and dams.....	81	48	0
Monongahela River locks and dams.....	37	36	0
Total.....	26,173	20,615	8,156

RHODE ISLAND¹

¹ None.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clark Hill.....	50,700	33,400	26,800
New Savannah Bluff.....	10	10	0
Total.....	50,710	33,410	26,800

SOUTH DAKOTA

Cold Brook.....	472	436	400
Lake Traverse.....	547	102	0
Fort Randall.....	104,113	22,378	0
Gavins Point.....	19,654	7,476	0
Total.....	124,786	30,392	400

TENNESSEE

Center Hill.....	38,557	20,360	20,150
Cumberland lock and dam D.....	0	0	0
Dale Hollow.....	43,094	20,300	20,100
Cheatham lock and dam.....	5,658	2,736	2,500
Old Hickory.....	25,637	9,555	9,200
Cumberland lock and dam C.....	0	0	0
Total.....	112,946	52,951	51,950

10 PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR RESERVOIR AREAS

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

TEXAS

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Hords Creek.....	3,027	2,517	1,000
Dam B.....	21,751	8,051	6,750
Lewisville.....	44,644	21,174	14,350
San Angelo.....	18,016	12,576	8,000
Lavon.....	28,745	14,665	12,550
Belton.....	23,848	11,548	8,300
Benbrook.....	7,724	3,954	1,000
Grapevine.....	14,900	7,520	2,850
Lake Texarkana.....	78,526	49,300	35,000
Whitney.....	37,658	14,108	10,600
Denison.....	60,504	34,786	0
Ferrells Bridge.....	29,300	10,600	0
Total.....	365,643	190,799	100,400

UTAH¹

¹ None.

VERMONT

Union Village.....	1,297	1,297	910
--------------------	-------	-------	-----

VIRGINIA

Philpott.....	9,330	6,500	5,000
John H. Kerr.....	79,847	44,200	33,700
Bluestone.....	1,650	1,650	1,200
Total.....	90,827	52,350	39,900

WASHINGTON

Chief Joseph.....	3,604	718	0
Mud Mountain.....	2,345	2,345	2,194
McNary.....	31,829	8,624	0
Bonneville.....	307	191	70
The Dalles.....	1,358	567	0
Mill Creek.....	637	584	0
Hiram M. Chittenden locks.....	97	19	0
Total.....	40,177	13,048	2,264

WEST VIRGINIA

Tygart.....	2,683	1,330	1,000
Bluestone.....	20,271	18,351	15,000
Sutton.....	10,350	8,830	8,000
Ohio River locks and dams.....	187	127	0
Monongahela River locks and dams.....	40	36	0
Kanawha River locks and dams.....	72	56	0
Total.....	33,603	28,730	24,000

WISCONSIN

Fox River navigation.....	545	545	0
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	30,669	5,789	2,268
Total.....	31,214	6,334	2,268

WYOMING¹

¹ None.



86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 9377

[Report No. 1298]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 6, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

MARCH 1, 1960

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United
4 States to provide that reservoir areas of projects for flood
5 control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and
6 other related purposes *owned in fee and* under the jurisdiction
7 of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers
8 shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage, pro-
9 mote, and assure fully adequate and dependable future re-

1 sources of readily available timber, through sustained yield
2 programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation prac-
3 tices, and to increase the value of such areas for conserva-
4 tion, recreation, and other beneficial uses: *Provided, That*
5 *such development and management shall be accomplished to*
6 *the extent practicable and compatible with other uses of the*
7 *project.*

8 SEC. 2. In order to carry out the national policy de-
9 clared in the first section of this Act, the Chief of Engineers,
10 under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, shall
11 provide for the protection and development of forest *or other*
12 *vegetative cover* ~~of~~ *and the establishment and maintenance of*
13 *other conservation measures on* reservoir areas under his
14 jurisdiction, so as to yield the maximum benefit and other-
15 wise improve such areas. Programs and policies developed
16 pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be coordinated with
17 the Secretary of Agriculture, and with appropriate State
18 conservation agencies.

80TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. R. 9377

[Report No. 1298]

A BILL

To provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi

JANUARY 6, 1960

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

MARCH 1, 1960

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued March 8, 1960
For actions of March 7, 1960
86th-2d, No. 42

ASC committees.....	26		
Atomic energy.....	14		
Attaches.....	8		
Brucellosis.....	4		
CCC.....	22		
Conservation.....	19		
Dairy products.....	22		
Egg prices.....	6		
Electrification.....	1		
Farm income.....	11		
Farm program.....	15		
Food.....	14		
Foreign aid.....	3,17		
Foreign currencies.....	5		
Forestry.....	10		
Interest rates.....	12,20		
Lands.....	28		
Livestock.....	23		
Marketing.....	23		
Military construction.....	5		
Minerals.....	9		
Personnel.....	8,25,26		
Postal rates.....	24		
Prices.....	6,18		
Purchasing.....	29		
Reclamation.....	27		
Research.....	2,4,21		
Saline water.....	2		
Sugar.....	13		
Surplus commodities.....	22		
Taxation.....	18		
Textiles.....	16		
Water pollution.....	21		
Wildlife.....	7		

HIGHLIGHTS: House subcommittee voted to report measure to authorize increased appropriations for brucellosis eradication program.

SENATE

ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Johnston inserted a newspaper editorial commending the rural electrification program, and stating "The coming of REA and the rural co-ops constituted a real revolution in rural living -- the greatest revolution in American rural living in the history of the Nation." pp. 4404-5

2. SALINE WATER. Received a R. I. General Assembly resolution urging the establishment of a saline water conversion plant on one of the inactive Federal Government-owned sites on the island of Aquidneck, R. I. p. 4400

3. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received from the State Department a report on the mutual security program and a general summary report of plans on grant economic assistance relating to defense support and special assistance programs. pp. 4399, 4396

HOUSE

4. RESEARCH; BRUCELLOSIS ERADICATION. The Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee H. J. Res. 619, to authorize an increase in appropriations for the burcellosis eradication program. p. D180

5. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION; FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Debated H. R. 10777, the military construction authorization bill. At the request of Rep. Vinson for a ye and nay vote, the final vote on the bill was deferred until Wed., Mar. 9.
The Armed Services Committee in reporting this bill stated, regarding the use of foreign currencies obtained under Public Law 480 for the construction of overseas military housing, that "Beginning in fiscal year 1961 direct appropriations will be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign currencies at the time they are used rather than providing reimbursement from quarters allowances as has been the practice to date." pp. 4367-83
6. EGG PRICES. Rep. Hoffman, Mich., commented on an article connecting the poultry producers in New Jersey with James Hoffa, stating that because of the low price of eggs the producers are asking Hoffa "to take over." p. 4310
7. WILDLIFE. Passed over, at the request of Rep. Aspinall, H. R. 2565, to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations. p. 4327
8. PERSONNEL; ATTACHES. Passed over, at the request of Rep. Gross, H. R. 8074, to permit the assignment of agricultural attaches for a maximum of 4 years in the U. S. without grade reduction. p. 4327
9. MINERALS. Passed, without amendment (in lieu of a similar bill H. R. 7987), S. 2061, to authorize the issuance of prospecting permits for phosphate in lands belonging to the U. S. This bill will now be sent to the President. The House bill H. R. 7987 was tabled. pp. 4329-30
Received a memorial from the Alaska State Legislature requesting passage of S. 2909, to repeal an Act entitled "An Act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the District of Alaska." p. 4398
10. FORESTS. Passed, as reported, H. R. 9377, to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. p. 4332
11. FARM INCOME. Rep. Albert inserted an article which states that "Farmers retained a smaller portion of their total farm income last year than in any previous year on record," and in reply to a comment by Rep. Arends, requested that he "use his great influence with the White House to prevail on the President not to veto the next bill we (Congress) send to him." pp. 4383-4
Rep. McGovern inserted an article which reported on a meeting of the Governors of 10 Midwestern States, in which it states "The immediate aim of the group is to lobby before Congress for the omnibus Poage bill." p. 4384
12. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Patman inserted and discussed a statement made by the Democratic Advisory Council's Administrative Committee which concludes by stating "we are strongly opposed to the removal of the 4½% interest ceiling" on long-term Government securities. pp. 4393-5

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. SUGAR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Martin inserting an article, "The Philippine Sugar Industry In 1959," and stating that "in considering quotas to be awarded to foreign nations in the new (sugar) legislation, we should bear in mind that the Philippines are a friendly and important ally in an area of the world where we need friends." pp. A1918-9

at any time thereafter without regard to total length of service, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the grade and retired pay of vice admiral unless entitled to a higher retired grade under other provisions of law.

"(d) An Assistant Commandant who retires within two and one-half years of the date of his original assignment as Assistant Commandant shall retire in his permanent grade and with the retired pay of that grade unless entitled to a higher retired grade under other provisions of law. However, section 243 of this title shall not apply to an officer retiring within two and one-half years of the date of his original assignment as Assistant Commandant."

(7) Sections 48 and 49 are repealed.

(8) The analysis of chapter 3 is amended by striking out the following items:

"45. Permanent grade of Commandant on expiration of term

"47. Assistant Commandant and Engineer in Chief; appointment

"48. Permanent grade of Assistant Commandant and Engineer in Chief on expiration of term

"49. Retirement of Assistant Commandant and Engineer in Chief"

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"47. Assistant Commandant; assignment; retirement."

(9) Section 186 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 186. Civilian teaching staff

"The Secretary may appoint in the Coast Guard such number of civilian members of the teaching staff at the Academy as the needs of the Service may require, whose compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. They shall have such titles and perform duties as prescribed by the Secretary. Leaves of absence and hours of work for such personnel shall be governed by regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, without regard to section 84, chapter 18, subchapter IV of chapter 21, sections 1112, 1113, and 1121-1125, and chapter 23, of title 5."

(10) Section 187 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 187. Permanent commissioned teaching staff; composition

"The permanent commissioned teaching staff at the Academy shall consist of professors, associate professors, assistant professors and instructors, in such numbers as the needs of the Service require. They shall perform duties as prescribed by the Commandant, and exercise command only in the academic department of the Academy."

(11) Section 188 is amended—

(A) By striking out in the first sentence the word "commissioned" which precedes the word "instructors"; and

(B) By striking out in the second sentence the word "instructor" and inserting the words "member of the teaching staff" in place thereof.

(12) Section 189 is amended—

(A) By striking out in the first sentence the word "commissioned" which precedes the word "instructors".

(B) By striking out in the last sentence the word "or" which precedes the word "assistant", and inserting a comma and the words "or instructor" after the words "assistant professor".

(13) Section 190 is amended—

(A) By striking out in the first sentence the word "commissioned" which precedes the words "instructors in the Coast Guard".

(B) By striking out in the first sentence the words "instructor or civilian librarian" which precede the words "at the Academy"

and inserting the words "member of the teaching staff" in place thereof.

(C) By striking out the word "commissioned" which precedes the word "instructor" wherever it appears in this section.

(14) Section 191 is amended—

(A) By striking out in the title of this section the words "civilian instructor" and inserting the words "member of civilian teaching staff" in place thereof.

(B) By striking out the words "civilian instructor or civilian librarian" and inserting the words "member of the civilian teaching staff" in place thereof.

(C) By striking out the word "commissioned" wherever it appears.

(15) The analysis of chapter 9 is amended by striking out the following items:

"191. Credit for service as civilian instructor" and inserting the following items in place thereof:

"191. Credit for service as member of civilian teaching staff"

(16) Section 222 is amended by striking out the words, "except that the Assistant Commandant shall, while holding such office, be next in precedence to the Commandant."

(17) Subsection (c) of section 247 is amended by striking out all language following the words "as Commandant" and inserting a period in lieu of the comma following the word "Commandant".

(18) Section 365 is amended—

(A) By inserting in the first sentence after the word "extended" the words "and re-extended"; and by striking out in the same sentence the word "four" and inserting the word "six" in place thereof.

(B) By adding at the end of the first sentence the following new sentence: "However, the total of all such extensions of an enlistment may not exceed six years."

(19) Section 482 is amended by striking out the words "whose pay and allowances are specifically provided by this or any other law to be the pay and allowances of the upper half," and inserting the words "rear admirals who may be serving as Commandant and Assistant Commandant."

SEC. 2. The increased grade of admiral for the Commandant and vice admiral for the Assistant Commandant, including the pay and allowances applicable to such grades, shall be effective on the first day of the month following enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Except as provided by section 2, the amendments by section 1 shall not operate to change or deprive the present incumbents serving as Commandant, Assistant Commandant, and Engineer in Chief of any rights, benefits and privileges appertaining to such offices on the day preceding the date of enactment of this Act, nor to divest them of their offices for the terms appointed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BETTER ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10045) to amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 26, 1930, as amended (U.S.C.,

title 19, sec. 68, 1952 edition, Supp. V), is amended by striking from the proviso "\$30,000" and "\$60,000" and substituting in lieu thereof "\$40,000" and "\$80,000," respectively.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOUGLAS MCKAY DAM, OREG., AND JOHN A. BLATNIK LOCK, MICHIGAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2440) to designate the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir on Middle Santiam River, Oreg., as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir to be constructed on the Middle Santiam River near Albany, Oregon, authorized by the Flood Control Acts of June 28, 1938 (Public Law 761, 75th Congress), and September 3, 1954 (Public Law 780, 83d Congress), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Detroit Dam and Reservoir on the North Santiam River, Oregon, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938 (Public Law 761, 75th Congress), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Detroit Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir.

SEC. 2. In recognition of the fine leadership of Representative John A. Blatnik, and in tribute to his dauntless championship of the Saint Lawrence Seaway over a long period of years and his persistent and successful efforts for harbor improvements and connecting channels on the Great Lakes, the new lock to replace the existing Poe Lock on the Saint Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., shall be designated as the John A. Blatnik Lock as a fitting tribute to this congressional leader for his contribution in making the Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence Waterway system a reality.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended to read:

A bill to designate the Detroit Dam and Reservoir, Oregon, as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir, and to designate the new lock on the Saint Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik Lock.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR RESERVOIR AREAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9377) to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to provide that reservoir areas of projects for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and other related purposes under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate and dependable future resources of readily available timber, through sustained yield programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation practices, and to increase the value of such areas for conservation, recreation, and other beneficial uses.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the national policy declared in the first section of this Act, the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, shall provide for the protection and development of forest reservoir areas under his jurisdiction, so as to yield the maximum benefit and otherwise improve such areas. Programs and policies developed pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be coordinated with the Secretary of Agriculture, and with appropriate State conservation agencies.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "purposes", insert the following: "owned in fee and."

Page 2, line 3, strike the period and insert a semicolon in lieu thereof and the following: "Provided, That such development and management shall be accomplished to the extent practicable and compatible with other uses of the project."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "forest" insert the following: "or other vegetative."

Page 2, line 8, strike the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof "and the establishment and maintenance of other conservation measures on."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN GUAMANIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6392) to amend section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide detention and other benefits thereunder to certain Guamanians killed or captured by the Japanese at Wake Island.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In the case of any Guamanian killed or captured by the Imperial Japanese Government on or after December 7, 1941, at Wake Island, benefits shall be granted under subsections (a) through (f) of this section in the same manner and to the same extent

as apply in the case of civilian American citizens so killed or captured. Claims for benefits under subsections (a) through (e) of this section must be filed within six months after the date of enactment of this subsection, and the time limitation applicable to any individual by subsection (f) shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this subsection, with respect to any individual who is entitled to such benefits solely by reason of this subsection. The preceding sentence shall not be construed to affect the right of any individual to receive such benefits with respect to any period prior to the date of enactment of this subsection."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND FOR PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION HEADQUARTERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7579) to authorize the acquisition of land for donation to the Pan American Health Organization as a headquarters site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING ACTS OF SEPTEMBER 2, 1958, AND SEPTEMBER 11, 1957

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10419) to amend the act of September 2, 1958.

MR. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, I wish to commend and congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], and the subcommittee and the full committee for recommending this legislation to the House.

I think it contains a number of excellent provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1712), is hereby amended by substituting the words "two thousand" for the words "fifteen hundred" and by substituting the words "total of the annual quota for two years" for the words "annual quota."

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1713), is hereby amended by substituting "June 30, 1962" for "June 30, 1960."

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add a new section 3 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Section 4(a) of the Act of September 11, 1957, (71 Stat. 639-640) as amended by Section 2 of the Act of September 9, 1959, (73 Stat. 490) is hereby amended by substituting 'June 30, 1961' for 'June 30, 1960'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended to read "A bill to amend the Act of September 2, 1958, and the Act of September 11, 1957, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(MR. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[MR. BOLAND'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO NASA

MR. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, with amendments.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1961 the sum of \$915,000,000 as follows:

(a) For "Salaries and expenses," \$170,760,000.

(b) For "Research and development," \$621,453,000.

(c) For "Construction and equipment," \$122,787,000, as follows:

(1) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia: Hypersonic aerothermal dynamics facility and dynamics research laboratory, \$11,957,000.

(2) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California: Centrifuge equipment, \$980,000.

(3) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio: Energy conversion laboratory and basic materials research laboratory, \$9,100,000.

(4) Goddard Space Center, Greenbelt, Maryland: Payload testing facility; satellite systems laboratory; and utility installations, \$9,500,000.

(5) Pilotless Aircraft Station, Wallops Island, Virginia: Precision trajectory determination system; operations computing center; and equipment modernization, \$4,000,000.

(6) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California: Land acquisition; modernization of laboratory facilities; solid propellant facility; liquid propellant test cell; and antenna range, \$5,000,000.

(7) NASA Huntsville Facility, Huntsville, Alabama: Saturn static test facility; central laboratory and office facility; dynamic test facility; pressure test cell; and additions to existing facilities for structures engineering, guidance and control, fabrication, checkout, and assembly, \$26,750,000.

(8) Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Florida: Completion of the Saturn launching complex, escape mechanism, hydrogen system, new Saturn launching complex, staging buildings, and addition to the engineering and laboratory building, \$27,750,000.

(9) Various locations: Tracking facilities, \$27,750,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 9377

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 8, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

AN ACT

To provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United
4 States to provide that reservoir areas of projects for flood
5 control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and
6 other related purposes owned in fee and under the jurisdiction
7 of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers
8 shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage, pro-
9 mote, and assure fully adequate and dependable future re-
10 sources of readily available timber, through sustained yield

1 programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation prac-
2 tices, and to increase the value of such areas for conserva-
3 tion, recreation, and other beneficial uses: *Provided*, That
4 such development and management shall be accomplished to
5 the extent practicable and compatible with other uses of the
6 project.

7 SEC. 2. In order to carry out the national policy de-
8 clared in the first section of this Act, the Chief of Engineers,
9 under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, shall
10 provide for the protection and development of forest or other
11 vegetative cover and the establishment and maintenance of
12 other conservation measures on reservoir areas under his
13 jurisdiction, so as to yield the maximum benefit and other-
14 wise improve such areas. Programs and policies developed
15 pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be coordinated with
16 the Secretary of Agriculture, and with appropriate State
17 conservation agencies.

Passed the House of Representatives March 7, 1960.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To provide for the protection of forest cover for
reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the
Secretary of the Army and the Chief of
Engineers.

MARCH 8, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Public
Works

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

Issued August 17, 1960

For actions of August 16, 1960

86th-2d, No. 134

CONTENTS

Claims.....	14
Conservation.....	13
Conservation reserve....	17
Consumers.....	18
Copyrights.....	20
Crop insurance.....	17
Experiment stations.....	17
Extension service.....	17
Farm loans.....	17
Farm program.....	11
Food marketing.....	19
Foreign affairs.....	7
Forestry.....	3
Grain storage.....	16,17
Grapes and plums.....	17
Guam.....	17
Humane slaughter.....	17
Labor standards.....	1
Lands.....	4,17

Minimum wage.....	1
Mutual security.....	2
Pay.....	3
Personnel.....	3
Recreation.....	4
School lunch.....	12
Special milk.....	12
Stockpiling.....	9
Submerged lands.....	15
Surplus commodities.....	9
Trade agreements.....	7
Transportation.....	21
Water resources.....	6
Watersheds.....	5,10,17

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated minimum wage bill.

SENATE

1. LABOR STANDARDS. Continued debate on S. 3753, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 and to increase the coverage of persons under the Act. pp. 15302-3, 15317-41

By a vote of 42 to 56, rejected an amendment by Sen. Holland to provide that, except as may otherwise be expressly provided by law, the Secretary of Labor shall have no power to regulate, either through the withholding of benefits or services or otherwise, the wages or hours of employment of employees employed in agriculture (as defined in section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938). pp. 15317-38

By a vote of 18 to 80, rejected an amendment by Sen. Cooper, in the nature of a substitute for the Holland amendment, to provide that, except as may otherwise be expressly provided by law, the Secretary of Labor shall have no power to regulate wages, hours, or other conditions of employment of employees employed in agriculture (as defined in sec. 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938) within the State in which such employees are recruited. Sen. Cooper explained that his proposed substitute amendment would prohibit the Secretary of Labor from regulating the employment of agricultural workers within a State, whereas the Holland amendment would prohibit him from regulating interstate employment of agricultural workers. pp. 15323-6

Agreed to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at 2 p.m., Wed., August 17, on the proposed Holland amendment to retain the present retail and service establishments exemptions under the Fair Labor Standards Act. p. 15338

2. MUTUAL SECURITY. The Foreign Relations Committee reported an original bill, S. 3855, to increase by \$100 million the authorization for appropriations for the President's mutual security contingency fund for fiscal year 1961 (S. Rept. 1836). p. 15279

3. FORESTRY. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 9377, to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army. p. D682
4. LANDS; RECREATION. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 900, to provide that 75 percent of all moneys derived by the U. S. from certain recreation activities in connection with lands acquired for flood control and other purposes shall be paid to the States. p. D682
5. WATERSHEDS. The Public Works Committee approved the following watershed projects: Leader-Middle Clear Boggy Creek, Okla., Fourche Maline Creek, Okla.; and Plum Creek, Texas. p. D682
6. WATER RESOURCES. The Public Works Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) S. Res. 325, to authorize a continuing study of the relative water resource programs of the U. S. and the Soviet Union. p. D682
7. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Foreign Relations Committee "approved an original bill authorizing \$500 million for assistance in the development of Latin America, and \$100 million for aid in the reconstruction of Chile." p. D682
Received from the President the annual report covering U. S. participation in the United Nations during 1959. pp. 15303-5
Received from the President the annual report on operation of the trade agreements program. p. 15305
8. PERSONNEL; PAY. Sen. Byrd, Va., submitted the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on Federal employment and pay for June 1960. pp. 15279-83
9. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; STOCKPILING. Sen. Byrd, Va., submitted the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on Federal stockpile inventories as of May 1960, including COC commodity inventories. pp. 15283-9

HOUSE

10. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau plans for work improvements on the following watersheds: Long Marsh, Md.; Timber Creek, Okla.; Kickapoo Creek, Tex.; Leatherwood Creek, Va.; Fourche Maline Creek Leader-Middle Clear Boggy Creek, Okla.; and Plum Creek, Tex.; to Public Works Committee. p. 15353

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

11. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Gore inserted Sen. Church's keynote speech at the Democratic National Convention which contains a criticism of the administration's farm program. pp. A6089-92
12. SCHOOL LUNCH; SPECIAL MILK. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley commending the school lunch and special milk programs and inserting a report on the way in which these programs are "serving the citizens of Wisconsin." p. A6092

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued August 19, 1960
For actions of August 13, 1960
86th-2d, No. 136

Acreage allotments.....	10		
Civil defense.....	2		
Congressional committees.....	13		
Consumers.....	21		
Electrification.....	18		
Exhibits.....	12		
Farm implements.....	1		
Foreign aid.....	8		
Foreign trade.....	9,15		
Forestry.....	6,20	Milk and butterfat.....	8
Freight forwarders.....	8	Minerals.....	3
Grapes and plums.....	9	Minimum wage.....	1
Information.....	12	Mutual security.....	3,19
Labor standards.....	1	Organization.....	21
Lands.....	3,7,8,11	REA.....	18
Legislative program.....	8	Reclamation.....	14
		Recreation.....	7
		Small business.....	22
		Soil bank.....	10
		Soil conservation.....	4
		Soil science.....	17
		Water pollution.....	5
		Wilderness.....	16

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed minimum wage bill. Sen. Johnson announced bill to increase price support level for milk and butterfat to be considered today, Aug. 19.

SENATE

1. LABOR STANDARDS. By a vote of 62 to 34, passed with amendments H. R. 12677, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 and to increase the coverage of persons under the Act, after substituting the language of a similar bill, S. 3758, as amended. Further consideration of S. 3758 was indefinitely postponed. Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 15479-515, 15516-32, 15536-9

By a vote of 87 to 8, agreed to an amendment by Sen. Anderson, as modified by an amendment by Sen. Allott, to exempt from the Act any employee employed by an establishment engaged in the business of selling automobiles or trucks, or farm implements, more than 50 percent of which establishment's annual sales is made within the State in which located and not less than 75 percent of annual sales is not for resale and is recognized as retail sales or services in the automotive industry. pp. 15506-11

By a vote of 50 to 46, agreed to an amendment by Sen. Cooper to strike out a provision of the bill which would have provided that employees engaged in canning and processing and certain other activities on agricultural commodities shall have 20 weeks overtime exemption each year (10 weeks limited to 12 hours a day or 56 hours a week, plus 10 weeks unlimited overtime exemption) instead of the present 28 exempt overtime weeks each year. pp. 15521-23

By a vote of 41 to 56, rejected an amendment by Sen. Prouty, in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill, which would have raised the minimum wage to \$1.10 an hour instead of the proposed \$1.25 an hour, and would have extended coverage of the Act to approximately 4 million additional persons instead of approximately 5 million additional persons. pp. 15479-92

Sen. Stennis submitted, but later withdrew, a proposed amendment which would have defined the words "area of production" so as to exempt certain employees engaged in the first processing of certain agricultural commodities. pp. 15520-21

2. CIVIL DEFENSE. Sen. Young, O., criticized the civil defense program, calling it "nothing more than a futile gesture to fool ourselves and American taxpayers into thinking that something is being done to defend our civilians," and stating that civil defense "is a part of the total defense of our country" and "must be placed in the hands of and be the responsibility of the Armed Forces." pp. 15464-5
3. PUBLIC LANDS; MINERALS. H. R. 8860, "to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other land" was made the unfinished business of the Senate. p. 15533
4. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Morse discussed and commended the work of the soil conservation district employees in his State, and inserted an article, "The Meaning of Conservation" which "sets forth the philosophy of soil conservation." pp. 15539-40
Sen. Morse paid tribute to Hugh Bennett, former administrator of SCS, calling him "a great public servant who ranks in our national roster with the other heroes of national resource conservation and protection." p. 15540
5. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Morse discussed and inserted an article, "Water Pollution: A National Disgrace" in which the author warns "the startling truth is that the hour is rapidly approaching when the Nation's water utilities may be unable to supply enough pure water for our expanding population." pp. 15543-5
6. FORESTRY. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9377, to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army (S. Rept. 1842). p. 15459
7. LANDS; RECREATION. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 900, to provide that 75 percent of all moneys derived by the U. S. from certain recreation activities in connection with lands acquired for flood control and other purposes shall be paid to the States (S. Rept. 1840). p. 15459
8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that the following bills will be considered today, Aug. 19: S. 2917, to increase the price support level for milk and butterfat; H. R. 5068, to provide for licensing independent foreign freight forwarders; S. 2855, increased authorizations for President's mutual security contingency fund; S. 3861, providing for assistance in the development of Latin America and reconstruction in Chile; and H. R. 8860, to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small producers on public lands. p. 15533

HOUSE

9. GRAPES AND PLUMS; FOREIGN TRADE. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 1857, to establish minimum standards on grapes and plums in foreign commerce (H. Rept. 2107). p. 15552
10. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; SOIL BANK. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 12849, to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land-use changes under the Great Plains conservation program and the soil bank program against loss of cropland acreage and acreage allotments (H. Rept. 2109). p. 15552

PROVIDING FOR THE PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR RESER-
VOIR AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE SECRETARY OF
THE ARMY AND THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

AUGUST 18 (legislative day, AUGUST 11), 1960.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 9377]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 9377) to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 9377 is to declare it to be the policy of the United States to provide that reservoir areas owned in fee under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage, promote, and assure adequate and dependable future resources of readily available timber, through sustained yield programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation practices, and to increase the value of such area for conservation, recreation, and other purposes, compatible with other uses of the project. Programs and policies developed by the Chief of Engineers with respect to protection and development of forest or other vegetative cover, and maintenance of other conservation measures on reservoir areas, would be coordinated with the Secretary of Agriculture and appropriate State agencies.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The total acreage owned in fee title in projects under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers amounts to almost 4 million acres, of which approximately 2 million acres are above the normal pool level and are in many cases suitable for development for beneficial uses.

Approximately 750,000 acres of this area are suitable for timber production.

Reforestation practice and establishment of vegetative cover on suitable land has long been recognized as a desirable goal in the conservation of natural resources. The establishment of sustained-yield practices in the timberlands throughout the country, both public and private, has grown in extent in recent years and is recognized to be a desirable necessary tool in the protection of one of the most important national resources of the United States. Selective cutting over our timberlands insures a perpetual yield therefrom, yet additional forest areas will probably be needed to provide the timber requirements of our increasing population.

H.R. 9377 would insure the development of lands owned in fee title and not subject to annual overflow in reservoir projects under the control and jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers by encouraging and promoting sustained-yield programs, reforestation, providing vegetative cover, and accepted conservation practices, and provide general reservoir management to produce the maximum benefits from the area. These programs would be developed in coordination with the Secretary of Agriculture and the appropriate State conservation agencies. Such management and development would be compatible with other uses of the project, and would not interfere with the primary purposes for which the project was constructed. The provisions of the bill are not applicable to areas over which flowage easements only have been acquired.

The problem is specifically concerned with proper land utilization of those parts of the reservoir area not subject to annual overflow. Much of the land in certain reservoirs is in a seriously eroded condition. Runoff from heavy rains on the steep slopes creates gullies and carries large volumes of silt into the main body of the reservoir, which magnifies the sedimentation problem, reduces the life of the reservoir, and thus impairs the effectiveness of projects which represent many millions of dollars' investment of the taxpayer's money.

The Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service working with the U.S. Forest Service have undertaken reforestation and conservation work on certain lands. However, the acreage that has been reforested has been small and little new work of this kind has been initiated in recent years. Specific authorization for this work would permit the Corps of Engineers to include in budget estimates definite amounts to be used for this program.

The authority granted by H.R. 9377 would provide the incentive and the means whereby the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and State agencies, can adequately perform satisfactory forest management on Federal lands and thereby increase the income to the Government. Such management would serve as an example to, and education of, private landowners. It would benefit the general economy by increasing the return from the sale of forest products, provide valuable raw material for industry, and provide forest recreational areas around the reservoirs.

Due to the present policy of acquiring land subject to frequent or permanent flooding in fee, and acquiring flowage easements only on land that would be subject to infrequent flooding, the area owned in fee under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers that would be affected by this legislation will not increase to a large extent in the

future. Under existing law; 75 percent of the funds received from leases on lands acquired for reservoir projects are returned to the States for use on county roads, schools, and other purposes. Twenty-five percent of funds received from timber sales are likewise returned to the counties. The committee does not believe that where timberland is acquired for public purposes, timber management should stop, but that proper land utilization would insure that in a few years production of timber and selective cutting would permit many direct returns to the Federal Government and the communities. The committee notes that much of the area deemed suitable for timber production is located in Southern States where it is estimated that a sawlog can be produced from a tree in 20 to 25 years.

FEDERAL COST

No estimate of the Federal cost occasioned by enactment of H.R. 9377 is available. The committee is of the opinion that the value of the sustained yield of timber and other conservation practices would more than offset any cost which might be involved in planning or administering the program. In fact a small initial fixed investment would return large annual benefits over the entire life of the project.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

In approving H.R. 9377, the committee does not construe that such action would give duplicate authority to the Corps of Engineers with respect to national forest or other lands administered by other Federal agencies, or to engage in forestry operations on an extensive scale. Neither is it to be construed as authorizing the corps to acquire additional lands in fee, or prohibiting that agency from leasing or disposing of lands excess to the needs of authorized project purposes in order to protect and develop forest cover. The committee understands and expects the Department of the Army, notwithstanding the further legislative authority granted by H.R. 9377, to continue to utilize the interchange and transfer authority as to lands within or adjacent to national forests, land utilization projects, or other Federal land and resource development projects, and that full and complete use be made of the experience, technical knowledge, and facilities of the U.S. Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service in carrying out the programs envisioned by H.R. 9377.

The committee is of the opinion that good forest management for conservation of soil and protection and development of forest cover will improve recreational areas at reservoirs, reduce reservoir sedimentation, increase the income to the Federal Government and the economic benefits of the projects, and accordingly recommends enactment of H. R. 9377.

AGENCY COMMENTS

The comments of the Bureau of the Budget and the Departments of the Army and Agriculture on a similar bill, S. 3092, are as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1960.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of February 25, 1960, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 3092, a bill to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

This bill would declare it to be the policy of the United States to provide that reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate and dependable future resources of readily available timber, through sustained-yield programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation practices, and to increase the value of such areas for conservation, recreation, and other uses. The bill would also require the Chief of Engineers, in coordination with the Department of Agriculture and appropriate State agencies, to provide for the protection and development of forest cover of reservoir areas under his jurisdiction, so as to yield the maximum benefit and otherwise improve such areas.

The Bureau of the Budget is sympathetic with the bill's objective of protecting forest cover in reservoir areas. Under current established procedures, however, reservoir lands owned in fee which are suitable for forestry development and are not required for authorized project purposes can be declared excess to the needs of the Department of the Army and transferred to the Department of Agriculture for development under existing forestry programs of that Department or sold to non-Federal interests for forestry development. To the extent that lands required for project purposes can be economically developed for forestry purposes, either alone or in conjunction with surrounding forest lands, there is existing authority for project resource conservation and for leasing of project lands.

It would appear that S. 3092 could be construed as either authorizing the Department of the Army to acquire lands in fee or prohibiting that Department from leasing and disposing of lands excess to the needs of authorized project purposes in order to protect and develop forest cover. The bill also might be construed as requiring the Department of the Army to engage in forestry operations on an extensive scale. We question the advisability of these features of the bill.

In view of this and since we believe existing authority to be adequate, it is recommended that S. 3092 not be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1960.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of the Army with respect to S. 3092, 86th Congress, a bill to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

This bill would declare it to be the policy of the United States to provide that reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage and assure adequate and dependable future resources of readily available timber, through sustained yield programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation practices, and to increase the value of such areas for conservation, recreation, and other uses. The bill would require the Chief of Engineers, in coordination with the Department of Agriculture and appropriate State agencies, to provide for the protection and development of forest cover of reservoir areas under his jurisdiction, so as to yield the maximum benefit and otherwise improve such areas.

Beginning in the earliest stages of planning and continuing through all stages of construction, operation, and maintenance of Department of the Army reservoir projects for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and other related purposes, provision is made for development of a master plan for administration of project lands and waters as a framework for development and use of project resources. This overall plan is prepared by the Corps of Engineers in cooperation with all interested Federal, State, and local agencies, and includes specific plans for forest management, soil erosion control, agricultural land use, recreational development, and other beneficial conservation uses with the view of obtaining optimum benefits for all purposes.

Under present real estate acquisition procedure, lands acquired in fee title normally constitute only a narrow border strip along many miles of shoreline. Such lands are generally not adaptable to economic management of timber production. On the other hand, for many older projects larger areas of lands were acquired in fee and substantial areas are capable of productive forest cover. However, lands not required for project purposes are constantly under consideration for disposal.

Since lands of reservoir areas have shown greatest utility and value for recreational use, management for timber production should be developed so as not to interfere with recreational use or with other authorized project purposes. In order that the proposed legislation may recognize this fact, it may be desirable to modify the bill to include the following proviso at the end of section 1, line 3, page 2: "*Provided*, That such development and management shall be accomplished to the extent practicable and compatible with other uses of the project."

Under existing procedures, good forest management for conservation of soil and protection and development of forest cover is being accomplished in coordination with management plans developed in cooperation with Federal and State forest and soil conservation agencies.

The bill S. 3092 would give further legislative authority for this procedure. Although it is presumed that it was intended that the provisions of the bill would not interfere with the Department of the Army's program for disposal of excess lands, it is suggested that it may be desirable to modify the bill to include a provision to carry out such intent.

Accordingly, while the Department of the Army believes that enactment of S. 3092 would be unnecessary, it would interpose no objection to enactment of S. 3092 if modified as suggested above.

The Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of a similar report on a companion bill, H.R. 9377. The Bureau also invites attention to its letter to the committee dated May 3, 1960, wherein the Bureau recommends that S. 3092 not be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1960.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This is in reply to your request of February 25, 1960, for the views of this Department on S. 3092, a bill to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

The Department has no objection to enactment of the bill but suggests that it be amended on page 2, line 7, to provide for the protection and development of "other vegetative" as well as forest cover and for the establishment and maintenance of other suitable conservation measures on such reservoir areas.

The bill would authorize the Chief of Engineers to provide for the protection and development of forest cover on reservoir areas under his jurisdiction so as to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate and dependable future resources of available timber, reforestation, and accepted conservation practices, and to increase the value of such areas for conservation, recreation, and other beneficial uses. Programs and policies developed by the Chief of Engineers would be coordinated with the Secretary of Agriculture and with appropriate State conservation agencies.

The use within their capabilities of lands in reservoir areas is necessary to their maintenance in stable condition and to protection of reservoirs from sedimentation. It is our understanding that current procedures of the Corps of Engineers in management of reservoir areas under its administration are generally in accord with this approach.

The Department construes that the bill would not give duplicate authority to the Corps of Engineers with respect to national forest or other lands administered by this Department. Even though such lands may be flooded as a part of a Corps of Engineers project, they are not considered as being under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army.

A memorandum of agreement between the Department of the Army and this Department, dated December 16, 1946, provides that this Department shall retain jurisdiction over national forest lands at Department of the Army flood control reservoirs, except where such lands are needed for flood control works. Under its provisions, the Department of the Army agrees to limit national forest areas proposed for withdrawal as nearly as practicable to those actually required for flood control works. It appears that under this agreement there should be no conflict as to jurisdiction and to doing work under the provisions of this bill on national forest lands at flood control reservoirs.

Under the act of July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 656), lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army situated within or adjacent to national forests may be interchanged for lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture when effective management of public properties will be benefited. Lands in reservoir projects of the Department of the Army not essential to the project also can be declared excess and transferred to the jurisdiction of this Department if suitable for forestry and related uses. Our position in regard to S. 3092 is on the basis that the Department of the Army, notwithstanding the authority that would be granted by the bill, would continue to utilize the interchange and transfer authority as to lands within or adjacent to national forests, land utilization projects, or other areas where this Department has a land and resource organization in being.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE, *Acting Secretary.*

LANDS AFFECTED

A summary and a detailed breakdown by projects and States of the lands involved are given in the following tabulation. The lands for each project and State are shown as to the total owned in fee title, the area above the normal pool elevation, and the portion that would be suitable for timber production.

The acreages which are listed in the tabulation as being suitable for timber production may not in all cases be capable of sustained yield and timber management production or even properly to be considered as commercial forest lands. However, in all cases they can be managed for production and development of forest lands which will be beneficial from the standpoint of erosion control, recreation, and wildlife conservation. The committee also realizes that some of the lands recognized as being suitable for timber production are presently obligated under leases, permits, or other agreements.

Summary of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation

State	Land area in acres			State	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suit-able for timber production		Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suit-able for timber production
Alabama.....	9,500	4,500	1,000	Nebraska.....	45,848	23,084	7,500
Alaska.....	0	0	0	Nevada.....	1,530	1,530	0
Arizona.....	11,565	11,565	0	New Hampshire.....	10,104	9,764	6,830
Arkansas.....	258,874	154,123	71,468	New Jersey.....	0	0	0
California.....	50,045	39,075	0	New Mexico.....	15,315	5,721	0
Colorado.....	27,555	17,775	0	New York.....	10,000	1,775	650
Connecticut.....	2,520	25,200	1,760	North Carolina.....	27,340	15,100	11,500
Delaware.....	0	0	0	North Dakota.....	471,211	75,653	0
Florida.....	17,189	5,900	5,800	Ohio.....	27,513	14,850	10,900
Georgia.....	241,439	130,639	112,400	Oklahoma.....	367,331	250,002	0
Hawaii.....	0	0	0	Oregon.....	44,701	15,880	7,030
Idaho.....	10,461	4,238	338	Pennsylvania.....	26,173	20,615	8,156
Illinois.....	78,175	31,816	18,392	Rhode Island.....	0	0	0
Indiana.....	7,505	6,105	0	South Carolina.....	50,710	33,410	26,800
Iowa.....	69,305	41,447	20,652	South Dakota.....	124,786	30,392	400
Kansas.....	45,670	31,847	4,000	Tennessee.....	112,946	52,951	51,959
Kentucky.....	129,462	64,404	58,400	Texas.....	365,643	190,799	100,400
Louisiana.....	32,498	0	29,000	Utah.....	0	0	0
Maine.....	0	0	0	Vermont.....	1,297	1,297	910
Maryland.....	1,070	294	164	Virginia.....	90,827	52,350	39,900
Massachusetts.....	11,532	10,972	7,040	Washington.....	40,177	13,048	2,264
Michigan.....	0	0	0	West Virginia.....	33,603	28,730	24,000
Minnesota.....	24,064	4,015	53	Wisconsin.....	31,214	6,334	2,268
Mississippi.....	262,601	187,100	81,800	Wyoming.....	0	0	0
Missouri.....	180,086	90,560	31,839	Total.....	3,959,385	2,057,860	745,564
Montana.....	590,000	353,000	0				

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation

ALABAMA

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Demopolis lock and dam.....	8,700	3,700	1,000
Warrior lock and dam.....	800	800	0
Total.....	9,500	4,500	1,000

ALASKA¹

¹ None.

ARIZONA

Painted Rock.....	11,565	11,565	0
-------------------	--------	--------	---

ARKANSAS

Bull Shoals.....	65,352	34,885	15,451
Norfork.....	49,269	29,195	13,463
Blakely Mountain.....	82,400	42,300	25,000
Blue Mountain.....	17,082	16,990	6,569
Narrows Dam.....	16,200	8,900	4,000
Nimrod.....	25,147	21,291	5,906
Bayou Bodeau.....	1,148	0	1,000
Table Rock.....	2,276	562	379
Total.....	258,874	154,123	71,468

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

CALIFORNIA

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
North Fork.....	613	400	0
Isabella.....	16,427	11,000	0
Pine Flat.....	13,004	9,700	0
Brea.....	237	237	0
Fullerton.....	139	139	0
Whittier Narrows.....	2,613	2,613	0
Lake Englebright.....	1,716	1,500	0
San Antonio.....	369	369	0
Hansen.....	1,464	1,344	0
Prado.....	6,242	6,242	0
Sepulveda.....	2,097	2,097	0
Santa Fe.....	1,853	1,853	0
Lopez.....	101	101	0
Lake Mendocino.....	3,170	1,480	0
Total.....	50,045	39,075	0

COLORADO

John Martin Dam.....	21,775	12,775	0
Cherry Creek Dam.....	5,780	5,000	0
Total.....	27,555	17,775	0

CONNECTICUT

Mansfield Hollow.....	2,520	25,200	1,760
-----------------------	-------	--------	-------

DELAWARE ¹¹ None.

FLORIDA

Jim Woodruff.....	16,600	5,900	5,800
Lake Okeechobee Waterway project.....	589		0
Total.....	17,189	5,900	5,800

GEORGIA

Allatoona.....	38,000	26,000	24,000
Buford.....	56,300	18,300	17,000
Clark Hill.....	111,800	73,800	59,200
Jim Woodruff.....	35,300	12,500	12,200
New Savannah Bluff, irrigation and drainage.....	39	39	0
Total.....	241,439	130,639	112,400

HAWAII ¹¹ None.

IDAHO

Lucky Peak.....	6,450	3,600	0
Albeni Falls.....	4,011	638	338
Total.....	10,461	4,238	338

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

ILLINOIS

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Farmdale.....	679	679	500
Fon Du Lac.....	137	137	0
Illinois and Mississippi Canal.....	3,825	2,793	0
Illinois Waterway.....	200	200	0
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	73,129	27,802	17,892
Ohio River locks and dams.....	205	205	0
Total.....	78,175	31,816	18,392

INDIANA

Cagles Mill.....	7,300	5,900	0
Ohio River locks and dams.....	205	205	0
Total.....	7,505	6,105	0

IOWA

Coralville.....	24,119	19,219	6,000
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	45,186	22,228	14,662
Total.....	69,305	41,447	20,662

KANSAS

Kanopolis.....	21,243	12,943	4,000
Fall River.....	15,147	12,547	0
Hulah.....	830	707	0
Toronto.....	8,450	5,650	0
Total.....	45,670	31,847	4,000

KENTUCKY

Dewey Reservoir.....	12,200	11,100	10,000
Dale Hallow.....	9,306	4,400	4,400
Lake Cumberland.....	91,667	44,331	44,000
Rough River.....	9,235	4,135	0
Ohio River locks and dams.....	475	438	0
Green and Barren Rivers, irrigation and drainage.....	179	0	0
Kentucky River locks and dams.....	233	0	0
Total.....	129,462	64,404	58,400

LOUISIANA

Bayou Bodcau.....	32,498	0	29,000
-------------------	--------	---	--------

MAINE¹

¹ None.

MARYLAND

Youghiogheny.....	1,070	294	164
-------------------	-------	-----	-----

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

MASSACHUSETTS

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Tully.....	1,310	1,310	910
Knightville.....	2,430	2,430	1,700
Hodges Village.....	882	882	90
Birch Hill.....	4,396	4,396	3,080
East Brimfield.....	1,469	1,109	780
Buffumville.....	488	288	90
Barre Falls.....	557	557	390
Total.....	11,532	10,972	7,040

MICHIGAN¹¹ None.

MINNESOTA

Orwell.....	1,984	875	0
Lac Qui Parle.....	576	350	0
Mississippi River headwaters reservoirs.....	1,927	783	53
Lake Traverse and Bois De Sioux.....	812	152	0
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	18,765	1,855	0
Total.....	24,064	4,015	53

MISSISSIPPI

Arkabutla.....	36,070	24,200	5,800
Enid.....	43,454	30,400	11,000
Grenada.....	84,677	56,400	27,000
Sardis.....	98,400	76,100	38,000
Total.....	262,601	187,100	81,800

MISSOURI

Table Rock.....	56,953	14,067	9,486
Osage lock and dam.....	10	0	0
Clearwater.....	18,947	16,992	11,121
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	18,024	4,746	1,188
Wappapello.....	44,450	32,200	0
Bull Shoals.....	36,731	19,610	8,686
Norfolk.....	4,971	2,945	1,358
Total.....	180,086	90,560	31,839

MONTANA

Fort Peck.....	590,000	353,000	0
----------------	---------	---------	---

NEBRASKA

Harlan County.....	31,060	17,460	7,500
Gavins Point.....	14,788	5,624	0
Total.....	45,848	23,084	7,500

NEVADA

Mathews Canyon.....	800	800	0
Pine Canyon.....	730	730	0
Total.....	1,530	1,530	0

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Franklin Falls.....	3,640	3,640	2,730
Surry Mountain.....	1,688	1,448	1,110
Edward McDowell.....	1,172	1,072	110
Blackwater.....	3,604	3,604	2,880
Total.....	10,104	9,764	6,830

NEW JERSEY¹¹ None.

NEW MEXICO

Jemez Canyon.....	2,831	2,831	0
Conchas Dam.....	12,484	2,890	0
Total.....	15,315	5,721	0

NEW YORK

Almond.....	787	298	100
Arkport.....	327	135	50
East Sidney.....	402	0	0
Mount Morris.....	3,821	19	0
Whitney Point.....	4,663	1,323	500
Total.....	10,000	1,775	650

NORTH CAROLINA

John H. Kerr.....	27,340	15,100	11,500
-------------------	--------	--------	--------

NORTH DAKOTA

Homme.....	395	199	0
Garrison.....	463,000	73,000	0
Baldhill.....	7,816	2,454	0
Total.....	471,211	75,653	0

OKLAHOMA

Canton.....	19,797	12,077	0
Denison.....	134,948	77,586	0
Fort Gibson.....	74,586	55,486	0
Fort Supply.....	8,089	6,289	0
Great Salt Plains.....	31,935	21,235	0
Heyburn.....	7,314	6,244	0
Hulah.....	20,704	17,627	0
Tenkiller Ferry.....	30,777	18,277	0
Wister.....	39,181	35,181	0
Total.....	367,331	250,002	0

OHIO

West Fork, Mill Creek.....	1,280	1,097	0
Mosquito Creek.....	11,181	3,331	2,300
Delaware.....	7,850	6,550	6,000
Berlin.....	6,930	3,680	2,600
Ohio River locks and dams.....	272	192	0
Total.....	27,513	14,850	10,900

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

OREGON

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Cottage Grove.....	1,571	440	0
Dorena.....	2,465	770	0
Fern Ridge.....	11,532	2,220	0
Lookout Point.....	9,642	4,340	3,400
McNary.....	8,271	2,241	0
Bonneville.....	1,019	636	230
Detroit.....	7,247	4,000	3,400
The Dalles.....	2,954	1,233	0
Total.....	44,701	15,880	7,030

PENNSYLVANIA

Youghiogheny.....	2,844	780	436
Prompton.....	539	63	0
Crooked Creek.....	2,564	2,214	700
Mahoning Creek.....	2,533	2,363	1,000
Loyalhanna Creek.....	3,335	3,125	1,700
Tionesta Creek.....	2,797	2,370	1,000
Conemaugh.....	7,671	7,371	3,200
Bear Creek.....	1,803	432	0
East Branch, Clarion River.....	287	140	0
Indian Rock.....	1,644	1,644	120
Ohio River locks and dams.....	38	29	0
Allegheny River locks and dams.....	81	48	0
Monongahela River locks and dams.....	37	36	0
Total.....	26,173	20,615	8,156

RHODE ISLAND ¹

¹ None.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clark Hill.....	50,700	33,400	26,800
New Savannah Bluff.....	10	10	0
Total.....	50,710	33,410	26,800

SOUTH DAKOTA

Cold Brook.....	472	436	400
Lake Traverse.....	547	102	0
Fort Randall.....	104,113	22,378	0
Gavins Point.....	19,654	7,476	0
Total.....	124,786	30,392	400

TENNESSEE

Center Hill.....	38,557	20,360	20,150
Cumberland lock and dam D.....	0	0	0
Dale Hollow.....	43,094	20,300	20,100
Cheatham lock and dam.....	5,658	2,736	2,500
Old Hickory.....	25,637	9,555	9,200
Cumberland lock and dam C.....	0	0	0
Total.....	112,946	52,951	51,950

Breakdown by States of federally owned land at Corps of Engineers reservoir and navigation projects in operation—Continued

TEXAS

Project	Land area in acres		
	Total in fee	Above normal pool	Suitable for timber production
Hords Creek.....	3,027	2,517	1,000
Dam B.....	21,751	8,051	6,750
Lewisville.....	44,644	21,174	14,350
San Angelo.....	18,016	12,576	8,000
Lavon.....	28,745	14,665	12,550
Belton.....	23,848	11,548	8,300
Benbrook.....	7,724	3,954	1,000
Grapevine.....	14,900	7,520	2,850
Lake Texarkana.....	78,526	49,300	35,000
Whitney.....	37,658	14,108	10,600
Denison.....	60,504	34,786	0
Ferrells Bridge.....	29,300	10,600	0
Total.....	365,643	190,799	100,400

UTAH¹¹ None.

VERMONT

Union Village.....	1,297	1,297	910
--------------------	-------	-------	-----

VIRGINIA

Philpott.....	9,330	6,500	5,000
John H. Kerr.....	79,847	44,200	33,700
Bluestone.....	1,650	1,650	1,200
Total.....	90,827	52,350	39,900

WASHINGTON

Chief Joseph.....	3,604	718	0
Mud Mountain.....	2,345	2,345	2,194
McNary.....	31,829	8,624	0
Bonneville.....	307	191	70
The Dalles.....	1,358	567	0
Mill Creek.....	637	584	0
Hiram M. Chittenden locks.....	97	19	0
Total.....	40,177	13,048	2,264

WEST VIRGINIA

Tygart.....	2,683	1,330	1,000
Bluestone.....	20,271	18,351	15,000
Sutton.....	10,350	8,830	8,000
Ohio River locks and dams.....	187	127	0
Monongahela River locks and dams.....	40	36	0
Kanawha River locks and dams.....	72	56	0
Total.....	33,603	28,730	24,000

WISCONSIN

Fox River navigation.....	545	545	0
Mississippi River, 9-foot channel.....	30,669	5,789	2,268
Total.....	31,214	6,334	2,268

WYOMING¹¹ None.

Session 1897

H. R. 9575

June 18, 1897

That the Secretary of the Interior be and he is authorized to

execute and carry out all and several the foregoing provisions of this act

in full force and effect from and after the date of its enactment

Be it enacted

AN ACT

to amend an act approved June 18, 1897

relating to

the public lands of the United States

1. That the Secretary of the Interior be and he is authorized to

execute and carry out all and several the foregoing provisions of this act

in full force and effect from and after the date of its enactment

Be it enacted

That the Secretary of the Interior be and he is authorized to

execute and carry out all and several the foregoing provisions of this act

Calendar No. 1914

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 9377

[Report No. 1842]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 8, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

AUGUST 18 (legislative day, AUGUST 11), 1960

Reported by Mr. CHAVEZ, without amendment

AN ACT

To provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United
4 States to provide that reservoir areas of projects for flood
5 control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and
6 other related purposes owned in fee and under the jurisdiction
7 of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers
8 shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage, pro-
9 mote, and assure fully adequate and dependable future re-
10 sources of readily available timber, through sustained yield

1 programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation prac-
2 tices, and to increase the value of such areas for conserva-
3 tion, recreation, and other beneficial uses: *Provided*, That
4 such development and management shall be accomplished to
5 the extent practicable and compatible with other uses of the
6 project.

7 SEC. 2. In order to carry out the national policy de-
8 clared in the first section of this Act, the Chief of Engineers,
9 under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, shall
10 provide for the protection and development of forest or other
11 vegetative cover and the establishment and maintenance of
12 other conservation measures on reservoir areas under his
13 jurisdiction, so as to yield the maximum benefit and other-
14 wise improve such areas. Programs and policies developed
15 pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be coordinated with
16 the Secretary of Agriculture, and with appropriate State
17 conservation agencies.

Passed the House of Representatives March 7, 1960.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 1914

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 9377

[Report No. 1842]

AN ACT

To provide for the protection of forest cover for
reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the
Secretary of the Army and the Chief of
Engineers.

MARCH 8, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Public
Works

AUGUST 18 (legislative day, AUGUST 11), 1960

Reported without amendment

August 19, 1960

S. 3421, to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act so as to provide authority for the Commission to determine claimants if no claim is filed.

S. 3228, regulation of common carriers by motor vehicles within a State.

S. 3625, to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission.

H. R. 900, to provide that 75 percent of all moneys derived by the U. S. from recreation activities in connection with lands acquired for flood control and other purposes shall be paid to the States.

Passed over H. R. 9377, to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army.

9. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Moss criticized the administration's conservation policies and urged enactment of S. 2549 which the Senator states "would...establish and coordinate the Federal responsibility in conservation matters...require the President to transmit to Congress each year a 'Resources and Conservation Report' and 'create in the executive department a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers.'" pp. 15676-80
10. EDUCATION. Received from the Secretary of State a report on "the international educational exchange program for the period Jan. 1-June 30, 1959." p. 15555

HOUSE - August 19

11. EXPORTS. Received from the Secretary of Commerce the 52nd quarterly report on export control. p. 15684
12. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack stated that the legislative program for next week would include the following: On Mon., S. 2633, Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960; H. R. 12753, extending the Library Services Act; S. 2575, extending the Health Benefits Act to retired Federal personnel; H. R. 12419, providing advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before beginning any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemical designed for mass biological control; H. R. 12341, to extend the restrictions on the importation of shelled walnuts and dates; H. R. 9866, extending agricultural services to Guam; On Tues., the Consent and Private Calendars; and H. R. 7201, to provide for the comprehensive operation of hydroelectric power resources of the U. S. pp. 683-4
13. ADJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 22. p. 15684

SENATE - August 20

14. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Mansfield commended the work of the "bipartisan" sponsors of the dairy price supports bill which passed the Senate on Friday. p. 15686
15. FOOD FOR PEACE. Sen. Mansfield commended Sen. Humphrey's food-for-peace plan and called the Senator a "dedicated, a farsighted, and a humanitarian leader." p. 15686
16. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Proxmire criticized, and Sens. Mansfield, Johnson, and Carlson defended, the Senate-passed bill (S. 3861) to authorize \$600 million dollars for aid to Latin America. pp. 15688-90
17. OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE. Began debate on H. R. 12580, to provide Federal grants to

States for medical care for aged individuals of low incomes, and adopted Committee amendments en bloc. pp. 15694, 15697-723, 15725-41

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

18. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Kefauver inserting his recent address discussing the value of "partnership programs" as the keystones of Federal-State-local cooperative programs. pp. A6129-30
19. SOIL BANK. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley expressing his support for a continuation of the conservation reserve program and inserting an article expressing the views of the Izaak Walton League on this subject. p. A6131
20. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley discussing and inserting an article, "Your Hometown: Will It Grow or Decline During the 1960's?" which analyzes the factors which make a community grow, including the work of the Office of Area Development of the Commerce Department. pp. A6137-8
21. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley commending the Senate action on the dairy price supports bill and inserting his statement favoring the bill. pp. A6140-1

BILL INTRODUCED

22. WATER RESOURCES. H. R. 13055, by Rep. Rivers of Alaska, to establish a Water Resources Commission for Alaska; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Aug. 22: Watershed projects, H. Agriculture (exec) (Young, Brown, and Wetzel, SCS, to testify.

oOo

Mr. KENNEDY. I am delighted to congratulate the Senator from New York on what he is now saying with respect to Mr. Baruch. Mr. Baruch occupies a unique place in the affections of all Americans, and I am happy that the Senator from New York is bringing his birthday anniversary to the attention of the Senate. I join him in his commendation of Mr. Baruch's service to the country.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my friend from Massachusetts very much. I am happy that the Senator from Massachusetts has given voice to those very gracious words, which I know will warm the heart of this fine and great man.

Mr. Baruch has spent his four score and 10 years in bringing to full flower his extraordinary gifts of intellect, of heart, and of spirit, in the cause of his Nation, in the cause of all humanity. Few men can look back upon a life career marked by so many accomplishments and embellished by so many distinctions. Mr. Baruch is perhaps most widely known as the confidant and counselor of Presidents, the park bench sage whose words of advice have been a shaping force in the momentous historic decisions of certain of our Chief Executives.

In this regard, a most touching and significant ceremony took place earlier this week here in Washington when an official delegation of the Boy Scouts of America memorialized the favorite park bench of Mr. Baruch in Lafayette Park. This signal mark of honor took the form of the unveiling of a bronze plaque mounted on a granite block beside the wood-and-metal park bench that has been the scene of so many historic colloquies.

The genius and dedication and energies of Bernard Baruch have ranged many fields of human endeavor, and in each of them he has left the enduring mark of his achievements. He has stood as a towering figure in the world of finance, he is famed as a philanthropist and sportsman. And, in the service of his Nation in World War I, Bernard Baruch was one of the outstanding architects of our victory in his role as Chief of the War Industries Board.

Life has enriched Bernard Baruch, but he, too, has enriched life. He has spent the gold of his talents freely in the interest of his Nation, in the interest of his fellowman.

Here is a great man who wears his greatness lightly. Here is a man to whom the years have been good, because he has filled his years with the full measure of his gifts and his energies. That is why all America attends in spirit today the celebration of Bernard Baruch's 90th birthday. Our hearts wish an old friend well, and may the candles keep lighting his way into the still fruitful and happy years to be.

The high esteem and affection in which Mr. Baruch is held is amply demonstrated by editorials in this morning's New York Times and New York Herald Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 19, 1960]

NINETY USEFUL YEARS

Reaching the age of 90 in reasonably good health and spirits is an achievement all by itself. We doubt, however, that Bernard M. Baruch, whose 90th birthday falls today, ever gave much thought to living to a grand old age. His ambition, we suspect, was to be active in mind and body and to get useful work done. In this he has succeeded.

Mr. Baruch did well enough in his private business in his earlier years to enable him to give most of his later years to the service of his country. He would be remembered for his achievements as head of the War Industries Board during the First World War, but he did countless useful things between the two World Wars and after the Second World War and down to this very day.

Whether or not he likes to be associated with the old tradition of the bench on which he sat and to which eminent persons came to seek his advice we are not sure. We do know that his advice was always based on intelligence, experience and good will. When he disagreed with anybody he said so and when he agreed he said so. He went part of the way but not all of the way with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as with other Presidents before and since.

We wish this were Mr. Baruch's 50th or 60th birthday rather than his 90th. But we hope the physical constitution he inherited from his good physician father, Simon B. Baruch, will permit him to be with us and to give us good advice in years to come.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 19, 1960]

BARUCH AT 90: A VALUED VOICE

This is not the first birthday salute the Herald Tribune has published to Bernard Baruch, and we devoutly hope it will not be the last.

But there is something special about it, for it marks Mr. Baruch's passage from the ranks of the world's great octogenarians to those of its great nonagenarians. Mr. Baruch is 90 years old today, and the testimonials of respect and affection that have been greeting him annually for decades past will surely reach a new climax.

Even more remarkable than the length of his life is its usefulness. Longevity is an accident; public service a matter of choice. And Bernard Baruch's life has been devoted to the service of his country and his countrymen.

Whether as an adviser to Presidents or a park-bench philosopher he has invariably spoken his mind candidly, openly, and pungently. Today no less than a half-century ago, his remains a voice to be heard and heeded. We are sure it will continue so as he sails briskly past the 90 mark and heads for 100.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said: Mr. President, it is certainly a pleasure for me to join the millions of other Americans who extend congratulations to Bernard M. Baruch on his 90th birthday. Mr. Baruch is one of our Nation's elder statesmen who has devoted more than his share of time, energy, and money to public service in the interest of our entire Nation. I am especially proud that he is a native son of South Carolina and I know I speak for all the people of my State when I offer congratulations to Mr. Baruch at this time. I am honored to claim him as a friend and I sincerely wish for him many more healthy, productive years for as each year goes by our Nation has always benefited from the wise counselings of this patriot.

The call of the calendar was resumed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2652) to strengthen the internal security of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy for the training and development of leaders in a total political war, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC

The bill (H.R. 8860) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that is the pending business. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Calendar No. 1883, H.R. 8860, if the Senator from Ohio is present, and if I may have the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma and the minority leader, I wonder if it would be agreeable for us to have a unanimous-consent agreement for 30 minutes debate on the bill and 15 minutes on each side on amendments.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have a few comments to make.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have arranged for that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not think 30 minutes would be adequate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would 1 hour be agreeable?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was going to suggest 1 hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when we consider the bill we have not to exceed 1 hour on the bill and 30 minutes on amendments, to be equally divided between the opponents and proponents, in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a few remarks, but I am willing to do it after consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 10548) to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and general welfare of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2151) relative to the distribution of automobiles in interstate commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3324) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 12483) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 8665) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WABASH BASIN INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION— BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3625) to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this measure follows the pattern of the several study groups that have been formed, and I ask permission to insert at this point in the Record a brief statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, is this Calendar No. 1907?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. KEATING. Over, by request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I give notice that we expect to call the bill up by motion, because we have taken such action as is proposed in the case of every State that is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3855) to increase the authorization for appropriations for the President's mutual security contingency fund for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purpose, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PENSIONS TO HOLDERS OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR

The bill (H.R. 270) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate

of special pensions payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) subsection (b) of section 560 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "sixty-five" and inserting "sixty-two."

(b) Any person who, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a), first becomes eligible to apply for special pension under section 562 of title 38, United States Code, shall, if he files application for such special pension within such one-year period, be paid such pension beginning September 1, 1960, or the date he attains age sixty-two, whichever is later; but no person shall become entitled to payment of special pension by reason of the enactment of subsection (a) for any month prior to September 1960.

SEC. 2. Section 562 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Administrator shall pay monthly to each person whose name has been entered on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal of Honor roll a special pension at the rate of \$10, beginning as of the date of application therefor under section 560 of this title.

"(b) Any person entitled to special pension under subsection (a) may, upon written application to the Administrator, or to the Secretary concerned in the case of an initial application, elect to receive in lieu thereof special pension at the rate of \$100 per month, reduced (but not below the rate of \$10 per month) by any pension payable to such person under subchapter II of this chapter. If such application is filed with the Administrator within one year after September 1, 1960, payment of special pension at such rate shall begin on such date, or on the date the person filing such application first became entitled to special pension under subsection (a), whichever is later; otherwise payment of special pension at such rate shall begin with the month in which application therefor is filed with the Administrator, or the Secretary concerned, as the case may be.

"(c) The receipt of special pension shall not deprive any person of any other pension or other benefit, right or privilege to which he is or may hereafter be entitled under any existing or subsequent law. Except as provided in subsection (b), special pension shall be paid in addition to all other payments under the laws of the United States.

"(d) Special pension shall not be subject to any attachment, execution, levy, tax lien, or detention under any process whatever.

"(e) If any person has been awarded more than one Medal of Honor he shall not receive more than one special pension."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on September 1, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPMENT OF LATIN AMERICA AND RECON- STRUCTION OF CHILE—BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3861) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin

America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we will call that bill up by motion later in the day.

I am informed there are reasons for not considering on a call of the calendar all order numbers from 1911 through the remainder of the calendar, and that will complete the call, because I will ask that they go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will go over.

The bills ordered to be passed over are as follows:

S. 3524, a bill to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space.

H.R. 908, an act to validate certain overpayments inadvertently made by the United States to several of the States and to relieve certifying and disbursing officers from liability thereon.

H.R. 2178, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain changes in the road at the Whites Branch, Grapevine Reservoir, Tex.

H.R. 9377, an act to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

H.R. 12530, an act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va. and N.C.

S. 3713, a bill to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes.

H.R. 10346, an act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act so as to increase the rate of tax imposed on gross receipts from certain sales, and for other purposes.

H.R. 12563, an act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended.

S. 3681, a bill authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to combine for financing purposes the bridge across the west passage of Narragansett Bay with the Newport Bridge and any other project acquired or constructed by said authority.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was about to ask the Chair to lay the unfinished business before the Senate, but I shall withhold the request, because we want to have tributes now.

I ask unanimous consent that the Chair not lay before the Senate the lead and zinc bill and that the unanimous-consent agreement not begin to operate until after we have completed the tributes to the minority secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for 1 minute, for a brief insertion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to put into the Record a statement given this morning to the press by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House:

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

Issued Aug. 26, 1960
For actions of Aug. 25, 1960
86th-2d, No. 142

CONTENTS

Allotments.....	12		
Animal imports.....	5		
Appropriations.....	18,22		
Civil defense.....	16		
Commodity loans.....	21		
Conservation payments....	4		
Contracts.....	17		
Copyrights.....	6		
Development Loan Fund....	40		
Family farm.....	38		
Farm labor.....	8		
Farm program.....	14,30,33		
Feed grains.....	41		
Foreign aid.....	22,25,40		
Foreign service.....	28		
Foreign trade.....	32		
Forest highways.....	15		
Forestry.....	1		
Health.....	20		
Imports.....	13,34		
Labor standards.....	19		
Lands.....	2,7,26		
Loans.....	17,21		
Milk marketing.....	42		
Minerals.....	7		
Old-age assistance.....	23		
Personnel.....	3		
Poultry research.....	38		
Property.....	39		
Public debt.....	31		
Public works.....	15		
Reclamation.....	24		
Research.....	9,29,38		
Retirement.....	3		
Science.....	37		
Small business.....	17		
Small farmers.....	22		
Soil bank.....	36		
Sugar.....	10,43		
Surplus commodities.....	9		
Technical cooperation....	22		
Textiles.....	34		
Youth corps.....	22		
Water resources.....	11,35		
Watersheds.....	15,27		

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on mutual security appropriation bill. House agreed to conference report on Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Sens. Morse, Clark, and Keating endorsed President's proposal on sugar.

SENATE

1. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment H. R. 9377, to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16358
Sen. Humphrey urged preservation of wilderness areas, and inserted a newspaper article describing the recreational opportunities of northern Minn., particularly the Quentico-Superior canoe region. pp. 16379-80
2. LANDS. Passed without amendment H. R. 900, to provide that 75 percent of all moneys derived by the U. S. from certain recreation activities in connection with lands acquired for flood control and other purposes shall be paid to the States. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16358
Passed as reported S. 3339, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer 160 acres of the present U. S. Beef Cattle Research Station at Fort Reno, Okla., to the Secretary of the Army for use as a national cemetery. p. 16363

3. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported H. R. 8239, to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities to the day after an employee retires rather than the month after he retires. p. 16362
4. CONSERVATION PAYMENTS. Passed without amendment S. 2761, to validate certain payments for farmers for emergency conservation work in Oregon which the Comptroller General has held were not authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1957, inasmuch as the conservation practices were performed prior to its enactment. p. 16362
5. ANIMAL IMPORTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 10598, to amend and clarify certain provisions of the Criminal Code so as to reduce the hazards arising from the importation of injurious wild animals, to curtail traffic in such species, and to define types of wild animals and methods of transportation to which the code applies. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16366
6. COPYRIGHTS. Passed as reported H. R. 4059, to amend title 28 of the U. S. Code so as to protect copyrights from Government infringement by waiving the sovereign immunity of the U. S. for infringement of copyrights. p. 16367
7. MINERALS; LANDS. Passed as reported S. 1670, to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in Alaska. p. 16369
8. FARM LABOR. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Bartlett, H. R. 12759, to extend the Mexican farm labor program. p. 16368
9. RESEARCH; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Sen. Mundt was appointed to replace Sen. Hickenlooper as a conferee on S. 690, the industrial-uses research bill. p. 16381
10. SUGAR. Sen. Morse spoke in support of the President's message requesting authority to purchase from other countries 322,000 short tons of sugar which has been allocated to the Dominican Republic, stating that "it is imperative that the Department of Agriculture be relieved of its present obligation to buy sugar from the Dominican Republic" and that "the assignment of quotas in the existing Sugar Act was completely out of line with the political policy the United States has been trying to establish with our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere." Sens. Clark and Keating commended Sen. Morse's statement. pp. 16425-7
Received from this Department a proposed bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1943; to Finance Committee. p. 16332
11. WATER RESOURCES. Passed without amendment S. 3625, to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission for the coordination of Federal, State, and local plans for development of water and related resources in the Wabash Basin. pp. 16362-6
12. ALLOTMENTS. Received from this Department a letter reporting on four over-obligations of allotments in the Forest Service. p. 16332
13. IMPORTS. The Finance Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12659, to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid (S. Rept. 1913). p. 16333

under recognized principles of international law, then such a defendant would be improperly using the protective reciprocity device developed by the international court. As respects the United States, it cannot complain and is not concerned when the defendant invokes the domestic jurisdiction claim in a proper case, because it has retained the same right and the court would have no jurisdiction anyway. When a defendant nation invokes the domestic jurisdiction claim in a demonstrably improper case, and cannot be induced to change its position, it simply proves that such a defendant is not ready to deal maturely and in good faith on truly international claims. The United States and its nationals can well afford to take the risk to find this out. Until the United States improperly invokes the domestic jurisdiction claim, no other nation is in an honorable position to do so. It must be assumed that the United States will weigh each instance with meticulous care, and listen avidly to all arguments on the nature of the question submitted. The United States as a government in the area of international claims can certainly take care of itself. And U.S. nationals doing business abroad have carefully appraised the risks and have presumably protected themselves without regard to whether any of their claims are enforceable in the international court, and are satisfied with the stability and honor of the nations where they are doing business, and with the courts of the forum. The so-called argument of self-interest on the part of the United States is far outweighed by the benefit of retaining the Connally reservation.

To those who say that the risk is small, as does the American Bar Association's section of International and comparative law, it may be answered that they admit the existence of risk. Risks should not be taken with the domestic interests of the United States before such a tribunal.

The United States is a unique country. It has a unique Constitution. It holds a unique position in the world. It is by no means requisite that the United States follow other governments, who have either made no reservation or abandoned one previously made. Our stakes in maintaining the integrity of our position are high. We cannot expect anyone other than the United States to look after its interests. If the United States were the only nation making such a reservation, it would certainly in the present posture of world affairs be justified.

Americans may look to their own Constitution as well to learn why the Connally reservation should be preserved. By relinquishing this reservation we would permit the sovereignty of the United States to be substantially impaired. In effect, we would be giving to an international tribunal, without right of appeal or other redress, power to decide questions arising under the U.S. Constitution that might affect our country, its several States, and each of us in a manner contrary to that contemplated by the Constitution. The Founding Fathers might have welcomed the submission of truly international questions to a World Court on a case-by-case basis, or on a treaty-by-treaty basis where the international character of the issue is clear in advance. They certainly never contemplated an unqualified blanket release of sovereignty of the kind that would occur with the withdrawal of the Connally reservation. It is surely open to question whether the Senate should assume such power under the Constitution as it is now written.

SELF-JUDGING—ONLY A SLOGAN

The proponents of withdrawal seek to disparage the Connally reservation by indiscriminate use of the word "self-judging." It is demonstrably a sloganizing maneuver. The United States was under no obligation to submit any controversies to the World

Court. When it chose to submit some controversies but not others it was entirely proper to define, in any manner it chose, the extent of such submission. The declaration that it would not submit any controversies judged by it to be within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States was an honest, forthright statement. Subsequent events have demonstrated to many thoughtful Americans, whatever their sentiments may have been at the time, that the reservation was prophetically wise. The judgment of the United States that a controversy lies within its own domestic jurisdiction cannot be regarded as a judgment in its own favor in a case actually being litigated, which seems to be one of the implications suggested.

The reservation has not been a deterrent to the use of the World Court on truly international issues. The United States has submitted cases involving international disputes and abided by the Court's decisions. Nations which sincerely believe in the peaceful adjudication of international problems of a justiciable nature and want to use that Court are free to do so. Nor has it been established that America will use its reservation unfairly. If the United States cannot be trusted to be fair in this matter, how, from our standpoint, can more trust be reposed in this international tribunal?

The chief result of the reservation has been to retain in American hands jurisdiction over issues that are best decided by Americans.

It is true, perhaps, that resort to the court on genuine questions of international law does not occur as often as some of us might wish. However, the reason seems to rest largely on the widespread current belief that international problems of consequence should be settled at the diplomatic level by way of summit or comparable conferences, and not at the judicial level. The Suez Canal treaty, for example, might have made a justiciable case for the court, but instead, the resort was to diplomacy. It may be that the Berlin issue is of a justiciable nature; but it will doubtless not be settled in the World Court. Certainly, so long as the Communist nations refuse to use the court, the settlement of great international issues at the judicial level—world peace through world law—is not capable of realization.

RESERVATION IS CONTINUATION OF MONROE DOCTRINE

In fact scholarly research has demonstrated that the Connally reservation is completely consistent with our foreign policy beginning with the Monroe Doctrine, namely, that the United States has consistently reserved the exclusive right to pass on what have been called in official language "American questions".³

Is there then no hope for the increased use of law in resolving international disputes?

Definitely there is. The goal is well worth working for and working hard. But we must not make the Utopian move of jumping too far too soon. The question is one of means. We were closer to world peace through law in 1909 by virtue of The Hague conferences and of voluntary submissions to international tribunals than at any time since.

WORLD IS NOT READY FOR COMPULSORY COURT

The writer's belief is that we will have to go through a long period of voluntary submissions of problems to the World Court, either on a case-by-case basis, or on a treaty-by-treaty basis, or both, before

the world is conditioned to accept a greater degree of world peace through law than now exists. In the writer's judgment, we must attain at least a relatively calm atmosphere of legal settlement of international problems such as prevailed just prior to World War I (and this must include the Communist nations, without whom world peace through law is an utter impossibility) before we are ready to consider compulsory jurisdiction of any World Court, however constituted.

After all, the concept of peace through law contemplates maintenance of the status quo except as changed by orderly legal processes, either of legislation or of adjudication, or both. The brutal fact is that we are living in a world in which much of its population is dissatisfied with the status quo and is not willing to wait for orderly legal change but is prone to resort to revolution and the use of force.

We might as well look squarely in the face the cold fact that at the present time the sovereignty of the United States should not be impaired in favor of an idealistic and illusory concept, even if, for the moment, one were to concede that the Constitution as now written admits of such a relinquishment of sovereignty by Senate action. Our efforts should be directed toward gradually bringing back to this greatly troubled world a genuine respect for international law and order such as existed prior to World War I, and to further the cause of world peace through law in that direction. This will take time and may be impossible of accomplishment if the Communist nations continue the practice of making agreements only to gain time and then to break them at will. However, until then, the domestic affairs of the United States should not be risked with an international tribunal such as the present World Court.

Back in 1947, organizations such as the house of delegates of the American Bar Association recommended withdrawal of the Connally reservation. However, the international scene has changed so radically since those honeymoon days of relative harmony that the same association has disapproved of numerous proposed United Nations treaties as impinging improperly on the best interests of the United States. With all of the disillusionments and disappointments in the international field since 1947, changed conditions warrant a reexamination.

It is true that, more recently, in 1959, a committee of the section of international law of the association has urged in a published report (since approved by the section itself) the withdrawal of the Connally reservation "at the first favorable opportunity." The committee report and section approval do not represent action of the association itself. Association action is that of the house of delegates before which reconsideration of the 1947 recommendation is now pending. The section's committee adds that "its withdrawal would have broad international ramifications involving problems beyond our competence. Accordingly, we express no views as to the manner and timing of the withdrawal."

The writer suggests that the problems will also have broad domestic ramifications. These should be weighed with the most searching discrimination before any action is taken to withdraw the reservation. In the writer's opinion the time to do so has not arrived.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Under the previously agreed to unanimous consent arrangement, the clerk will call the calendar—

³Miss Eleanor R. Finch, a Washington, D.C., lawyer, widely versed in international law, has furnished the writer with a monograph prepared by herself which establishes the substance of this paragraph.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PATTORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to the order previously entered, the clerk will proceed to a call of the measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar.

COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3524) to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space, was announced as first in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, Mr. President, by request.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment, so that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to withhold my objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is aware of the fact that there are Senators who believe the additional office space needed for the White House staff should be provided by a remodeling of the present building known as the Old State, War, and Navy Building. The Senator from South Dakota is not opposed to that position particularly. He thinks it would be desirable to have an authorization passed at this session of Congress for the additional office space needed for the Chief Executive.

The reason is that if a new President should come to the Congress and propose an authorization, it might be subject to the objection or to the criticism that he was seeking to aggrandize the office. It is the hope of the present administration, which is obviously going out, that an authorization can be created.

The Senator from South Dakota, therefore, after consultation with members of the committee and of the staff, has drafted an amendment. He merely wishes to read it for the information of the Senate at this time, in the hope that those who have been concerned as to the possibility that the bill if passed as originally drafted, would result in the demolition of the Old State, War, and Navy Building, will be satisfied.

The amendment would read: "At the bottom of page, at the end of line 11, strike the period, insert a semicolon and the following:

Provided, That proposal (a) of said report shall be modified to provide for renovation and remodeling of the old State, War, and Navy Building to provide the additional Presidential office space.

I recognize that the bill hardly can be passed at this time, considering the ob-

jections registered with the committee, but I should like to have those who are concerned about the matter consider the amendment. Possibly the House, the committee, and the objectors may agree later to having the bill considered on motion, with the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Do I correctly understand the Senator from South Dakota to mean that if the amendment is agreed to by the Senate he will have no objection to the consideration of the bill at the present session of Congress?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. In fact, I hope it may be considered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator what objections have been made to the creation of the Commission recommended by the committee. I believe the Senator heretofore served as a member of the Building Commission.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not think I was a member of the Commission.

My understanding is that objections have been filed with the committees on both sides of the aisle. As nearly as I can determine the nature of the objections, they are based upon the probable demolition of the Old State, War, and Navy Building to provide the site. I had merely hoped that if we provided for the authorization, as stated, it would overcome the objections.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am in favor of the Senator's amendment. I think the Senator is correct. I know that no matter who is elected to be the new President, there is no question whatsoever about the need for additional office space.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico is eminently correct. The Congress has provided additional space for its requirements in the last few years. We have provided a second House Office Building, a third House Office Building, and a second Senate Office Building. Despite this, the President, with all the manifold duties and responsibilities which now adhere to that office, is confined to the cramped and crowded quarters in the wing of the White House at the present time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was mistaken in thinking that the Senator was a member of the Commission heretofore. That was the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKAL], who was the other Member of the Senate on the Commission, who served with some of the House Members. The Commission was headed by Mr. FLEMING of the Riggs National Bank.

Mr. Floete belonged to it, and several other officials of the Government. There is no question as to the need. Therefore, I hope that the objectors will accept the Senator's amendment, because I feel as the Senator does about the demolition of the Old State, War, and Navy Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very sympathetic with the views ex-

pressed by my friends from South Dakota and New Mexico. I think they made effective arguments. They will appreciate, however, I am sure, that objection was filed with me, and I am acting in a representative capacity. In that position, I am obliged to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] desire to file his amendment, or to have it printed and lie on the table?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN OVERPAYMENTS TO SEVERAL STATES

The bill (H.R. 900) to validate certain overpayments inadvertently made by the United States to several of the States and to relieve certifying and disbursing officers from liability thereon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE IN ROAD AT WHITES BRANCH, GRAPEVINE RESERVOIR, TEX.

The bill (H.R. 2178) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain changes in the road at the Whites Branch, Grapevine Reservoir, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF FOREST COVER FOR RESERVOIR AREAS

The bill (H.R. 9377) to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJUSTMENTS OF RENTALS UNDER LEASES FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

The bill (H.R. 12530) to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va. and N.C. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3713) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over. I wish to make clear that the only reason for the request that the bill go over is that it involves \$2,300,000 and is considered inappropriate for consideration on the calendar call.

Public Law 86-717
86th Congress, H. R. 9377
September 6, 1960

AN ACT

74 STAT. 817.

To provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to provide that reservoir areas of projects for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and other related purposes owned in fee and under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers shall be developed and maintained so as to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate and dependable future resources of readily available timber, through sustained yield programs, reforestation, and accepted conservation practices, and to increase the value of such areas for conservation, recreation, and other beneficial uses: *Provided,* That such development and management shall be accomplished to the extent practicable and compatible with other uses of the project.

Reservoir areas.
Conservation of
forest lands.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the national policy declared in the first section of this Act, the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, shall provide for the protection and development of forest or other vegetative cover and the establishment and maintenance of other conservation measures on reservoir areas under his jurisdiction, so as to yield the maximum benefit and otherwise improve such areas. Programs and policies developed pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be coordinated with the Secretary of Agriculture, and with appropriate State conservation agencies.

Approved September 6, 1960.

